

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFY, 1838; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT
OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916.

OFFICERS FOR 1968

Jerald C. Brainer	President	Robert S. Michalson	Int. Sec.
Harold Grissan	Vice-President	Guy S. Klett	Treasurer
Winthrop S. Hudson	Secretary	J. H. Nichols	Editor
(1100 S. Goodman St., Rochester 20, N. Y.)		F. A. Norwood	

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Leonard J. Trinterud	Robert T. Handy
Oginius Brown	Lefferts A. Loetscher
H. Shelton Smith	Raymond W. Albright
George H. Williams	Albert Celler

ADVISORY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Henry B. Washburn	Harold S. Bender
Winifred E. Garrison	Percy V. Norwood
Conrad H. Moehlmann	Kenneth S. Latourette
Frederick W. Loetscher	Matthew Spinka
John T. McNeill	Cyril W. Richardson
Wilhelm Pauck	Ernest G. Schwiebert
Mattsey H. Shepherd	Ray C. Petry
Roland H. Bainton	Sandford Fleming
E. R. Hardy, Jr.	Sidney E. Mead

Carl E. Schneider

Subscription prices are five dollars a year, one dollar and a half for single copies. Twenty-five cents a year should be added for foreign countries. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History. Subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, claims for missing numbers, orders for single copies of current or back issues should be addressed to Guy S. Klett, Presbyterian Historical Society, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. Claims for missing numbers will be honored without charge if made within two months following the regular month of publication.

Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editorial office, 306 Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in *Church History* are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Microfilm reproductions of *Church History*, beginning with Volume XVIII, are available to subscribers and to members of the Society from University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Publication Office is in Berne, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter March 9, 1934, at the post-office at Berne, Indiana, under the Acts of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (<i>Divinity School, Yale University</i>)	RAY C. PETRY (<i>Divinity School, Duke University</i>)
R. PIERCE BEAVER (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	MATTHEW SPINKA (<i>Hartford Theological Seminary, Emeritus</i>)
ROBERT GRANT (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	WILHELM PAUCK (<i>Union Theological Seminary</i>)
WINTHROP S. HUDSON (<i>Colgate-Rochester Divinity School</i>)	JOHN DILLENBERGER (<i>Divinity School, Drew University</i>)
SIDNEY E. MEAD (<i>Meadville Theological School</i>)	EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (<i>Princeton Theological Seminary</i>)

VOL. XXIX

MARCH, 1960

No. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS DEPRESSION, 1925-1935 <i>Robert T. Handy</i> - - - - -	3
SOME ASPECTS OF EARLY BOURBON POLICY TOWARD THE HUGUENOTS <i>George A. Rothrock, Jr.</i> - - - - -	17
THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE TORY-ANGLICAN ALLIANCE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION <i>Clyde J. Lewis</i> - - - - -	25
THE ROLE OF THE SOUTH IN THE PRESBYTERIAN SCHISM OF 1837-38 <i>Elwyn A. Smith</i> - - - - -	44
TOM BROWN'S SCHOOL DAYS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF "MUSCULAR CHRISTIANITY" <i>William E. Winn</i> - - - - -	64
METHODIST HISTORICAL STUDIES 1930-1959 (Part II) <i>Frederick A. Norwood</i> - - - - -	74
COMMUNICATION - - - - -	89

CONTENTS

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS - - - - - 91

THE PIETY OF ENGLISHMEN UNDER HENRY VII, 1485-1509	T. H. McDonald
THE PLACE OF REASON IN THE THEOLOGY OF LUTHER	B. A. Gerrish
THE COVENANT THEOLOGY OF JOHANNES COCCEIUS	C. S. McCoy
PROTESTANTISM AND THE PRINTING WORKERS OF LYONS	N. Z. Davis
THE OLD NORWEGIAN SYNOD IN AMERICA, 1853-1890	G. L. Belgum

BOOK REVIEWS - - - - - 94

METHODIUS OF OLYMPUS: <i>The Symposium, a Treatise on Chastity</i>	Robert M. Grant
GOODENOUGH, ERWIN R.: <i>Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period</i> (Vols. 7-8: <i>Pagan Symbols in Judaism</i>)	Robert M. Grant
DVORNIK, FRANCIS: <i>The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew</i>	Georges Florovsky
RENAUDET, AUGUST: <i>Humanisme et Renaissance</i>	Quirinus Breen
RIDOLFI, ROBERTO: <i>The Life of Girolamo Savonarola</i>	Donald Weinstein
ELTON, G. R., ed.: <i>The New Cambridge Modern History, Volume II: The Reformation, 1520-1559</i>	Lowell H. Zuck
HOLBORN, HAJO: <i>A History of Modern Germany, The Reformation</i>	Roland H. Bainton
DOLAN, J. P.: <i>The Influence of Erasmus, Witzel and Cassander in the Church Ordinances and Reform Proposals of the United Duchies of Cleve</i>	Gottfried G. Krodel
SMITS, LUCHESIUS: <i>Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin</i>	Edward A. Dowey, Jr.
BOUWSMA, WILLIAM J.: <i>Concordia Mundi: The Career and Thought of Guillaume Postel (1510-1581)</i>	Roland H. Bainton
McLELLAND, JOSEPH C.: <i>The Visible Words of God. An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562</i>	Martin Anton Schmidt
DUGMORE, C. W.: <i>The Mass and the English Reformers</i>	Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.
STEWART, RANDALL: <i>American Literature and Christian Doctrine</i>	John Loose
MEUSER, FRED W.: <i>The Formation of the American Lutheran Church</i>	Gene Lund
KUPISCH, KARL: <i>Zwischen Idealismus und Massendemokratie: Eine Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland von 1815-1945</i>	Franklin H. Littell
CROSS, BARBARA M.: <i>Horace Bushnell: Minister to a Changing America</i>	Robert L. Fern
KRAUS, C. NORMAN: <i>Dispensationalism in America, Its Rise and Development</i>	Ernest R. Sandeen
BRADEN, CHARLES S.: <i>Christian Science Today</i>	Ernest R. Sandeen
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL, Dec. 28, 1959	115
MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY, Dec. 29, 1959	116
SUMMARY REPORT ON THE CHURCH HISTORY SELF-STUDY PROJECT, 1958-59	116
REPORT OF THE TREASURER	118

THE AMERICAN RELIGIOUS DEPRESSION, 1925-1935*

ROBERT T. HANDY, *Union Theological Seminary*

"It is too early to assess the impact of the Great Depression upon American Protestantism," wrote Robert Moats Miller in his recent study of American Protestantism and social issues in the period between the world wars.¹ No doubt it is too early for any overall assessment, yet it is becoming steadily clearer that American religion passed through an important transition in the depression period. If we are to gain a fuller understanding of developments in American Christianity since the 1930's, then serious attention needs to be given to that bleak period. Inasmuch as our understanding of times long past are significantly influenced by our definitions of the present situation, attempts to deal with that particular period of crisis in our recent past may help us more adequately to see the whole story of American religion in fairer perspective. Furthermore, a number of recent dissertations, articles and books have dealt in whole or in part with the period between the wars; they provide guidance for handling the vast array of sources relevant for an understanding of religion in the depression, supply material for at least preliminary interpretations, and point to the need for further analysis. This paper is one effort to suggest some interpretative guide lines for further exploration into an important topic.

I

In approaching the problem, I believe that it is important to distinguish between the economic depression of the 1930's and what may be called the religious depression. That there was an intimate relationship between them I have no doubt, yet they are also distinguishable phenomena. William Kelley Wright, professor of philosophy at Dartmouth College, writing in the heart of the depression period, declared that "today we are passing through a period of religious depression not less severe than the concomitant moral and economic depression."² Some months before the stock market crash of October, 1929, William L. Sullivan, a Unitarian writer, prepared an article entitled "Our Spiritual Destitution" in which he noted that the religion of his day was "timorous, unimaginative, quick with comment upon the contemporaneous, but unable in the authentic manner of its great tradition to judge the contemporaneous by categories that are eternal."³ The effects of religious depression began to be felt by the middle 1920's within

*Presidential address, delivered before the American Society of Church History, December 29, 1959, in Chicago.

Protestantism, then the dominant and of course numerically the largest among the three overall religious groupings into which American religion is familiarly, though too simply, cast.

One sensitive indicator of a religion's vitality is its missionary program. By the middle of the third decade of the present century, Protestantism was becoming aware of a serious decline in missionary enthusiasm and conviction. At the 1926 meeting of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, there was evident discouragement on the part of missionary leaders concerning the apathy of local churches toward the cause of missions.⁴ Even after the disastrous effects of the economic depression had overtaken the missions boards, there was clear recognition that the problem was much more than financial, and that it had predated the economic crisis. "However, we all know that this is not a sufficient explanation of what was happening on the home base," Edmund B. Chafee reported in 1934. "Interest in missions was waning before the depression. All through the decade of the 1920's the foreign missionary enterprise was being questioned and it was failing to attract the vigorous support which it formerly enjoyed."⁵ In his sociological study of religion in the economic depression, Samuel C. Kincheloe reported that "even before the depression, missionary funds had begun to decrease."⁶ Examination of the income figures of the major mission boards for the later 1920's reveals an irregular pattern but with a generally declining trend—and this in a period of booming prosperity!⁷ In an article entitled "The Decline of American Protestantism," Charles Stelzle in 1930 reported that according to the United Stewardship Council, per capita gifts for benevolence fell from \$5.57 in 1921 to \$3.43 in 1929.⁸

There was also a decline in the missionary force in these same years. The number of foreign missionaries in 1929 was less by 4.7 per cent than that for 1923.⁹ The steadily waning interest of young people in responding to the missionary challenge was a source of concern at the 1929 meeting of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, at which it was reported that though 2700 students had volunteered for foreign service in 1920, only 252 had offered themselves in 1928.¹⁰ The decline of the missionary force for China was especially perplexing to missionary leaders, and led Albert W. Beaven to make a statement in 1928 that was in a strange way more prophetic than he could know. "What an absurdity if after one hundred years of service," he exclaimed, "after building up in China \$90,000,000 of missionary investments in terms of helpfulness, we were to abandon it, withdrawing our Christian representatives, forsaking the whole enterprise, while at the

very same time Russia with all the questionable principles she stands for is eager to offer the Orient men, counsel, money and moral backing."¹¹ It was the decline in missionary interest that led to the Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry in the early 1930's, which itself reflected a questioning of familiar missionary emphases within Protestantism.

The home missions movement also felt the pinch of declining interest and diminishing funds before 1929. Nearly two years before the crash, the executive secretary of the Home Missions Council said:

Almost all major denominations are now in a period of financial stringency in the conduct of mission work. We are in the days of falling budgets. There has been more or less retrenchment all along the line, and new work has been for several years practically at a standstill.¹²

On the rural church scene there was clear evidence of decline before 1929, both in terms of benevolence contributions and the attendance at services of resident members.¹³

The problem of falling attendance was not limited to the rural scene, of course, for churches in all areas reported difficulties in maintaining attendance levels. A general trend toward the dropping of traditional Sunday evening services, especially in the cities, was observed.¹⁴ Decline in Sunday school enrollment was also evident; C. Luther Fry found in 1930 that "the proportion of young people attending church schools is greater today than in 1906, but less than in 1916."¹⁵ Attempts to plot an "evangelistic index line" for a number of major denominations point to a sharp downturn in the winning of converts and the reception of new members in the 1920's.¹⁶ A somewhat less tangible evidence of Protestant decline was the lowered status of ministers. Paul A. Carter has pointed out that the ministry sank low in public esteem in this period; he quotes a minister of that time who declared that it was "a fairly safe generalization to say that no profession of men is so thoroughly empty of dignity and grace as that of the Protestant minister today."¹⁷

Many observers have called attention to the slump which overtook the social gospel in the later 1920's; it is referred to in the very title of Carter's book, *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel*. But in his recent examination of the period, Robert Moats Miller has found that "social Christianity continued to burn bright enough to warrant future historians in using slightly less somber hues in painting their pictures of the social attitudes of American Protestantism in the Prosperity Decade."¹⁸ I think the apparent contradiction may be resolved by concluding that though proportionately the social emphasis remained strong, the social gospel movement as a whole was caught in Protestantism's overall decline.

Some of the keenest observers of the religious life of the late

1920's recognized that they were in some kind of a religious depression. For example, the Episcopal Bishop of Central New York, Charles Fiske, was convinced in 1928 that he had "evidence of a sad distintegration of American Protestantism."¹⁹ And in his first book, published in 1927, Reinhold Niebuhr remarked that "a psychology of defeat, of which both fundamentalism and modernism are symptoms, has gripped the forces of religion."²⁰ At least part of the reason for the decline was the penetration into the churches of the prevailing mood of the 1920's. For Protestantism was deeply affected by the general disillusionment of the postwar decade. During the war itself, the American people, with the vigorous support of most religious leaders, maintained a spirit of high optimism. But the tide turned swiftly. As Arthur S. Link has recently reminded us, "the 1920's were a period made almost unique by an extraordinary reaction against idealism and reform."²¹ The rapid subsidence of the war spirit, so Walter M. Horton observed in a book written in 1929 but published the following year, led "to a wave of spiritual depression and religious skepticism, widespread and devastating."²² Protestantism felt the corrosive effects of disillusionment at the very beginning of the decade, for the collapse of the grandiose Interchurch World Movement in 1920 was at least in part caused by the swift change in mood. Winthrop S. Hudson has summarized the swift decline of Protestantism in a vivid way:

Nothing is more striking than the astonishing reversal in the position occupied by the churches and the role played by religion in American life which took place before the new century was well under way. By the nineteen twenties, the contagious enthusiasm which had been poured into the Student Volunteer Movement, the Sunday School Movement, the Men and Religion Forward Movement, the Laymen's Missionary Movement, the Interchurch World Movement, and other organized activities of the churches had largely evaporated.²³

As the decade wore on, scientism, behaviorism, and humanism became more conspicuous in the thought of the time. Religion was often viewed with a negative if not with a hostile eye. In his effort to state the case for "a promethean religion for the modern world," William Pepperell Montague declared in 1930 that "there is today a widespread and increasing belief that the minimum essentials of Christian supernaturalism . . . have been rendered antiquated, false, and absurd by our modern knowledge."²⁴ More extreme was Joseph Wood Krutch's pessimistic statement of "the modern temper" in 1929. Referring to such classic words as "Sin" and "Love," Krutch wrote that "all the capital letters in the composing-room cannot make the words more than that which they have become—shadows, as essentially unreal as some of the theological dogmas which have been completely forgotten."²⁵ Criticism of religion and the churches was expressed not only by men like Montague and Krutch, by H. L. Mencken and Sinclair Lewis, but also

by many less well-known men. One opinion study showed that although about 78 per cent of the views about traditional Christianity published in 1905 were favorable and only 22 per cent were unfavorable, by 1930 the situation had almost reversed, so that 67 per cent of the opinions published were unfavorable.²⁶

Protestantism was deeply penetrated by the disillusionment of the time in part at least because of a long-standing identification of Protestantism with American culture which left the churches quite exposed to cultural cross-currents. The roots of this identification go far back to the beginnings of American history. As André Siegfried stated the matter in 1927:

If we wish to understand the real sources of American inspiration, we must go back to the English Puritanism of the seventeenth century, for the civilization of the United States is essentially Protestant. Those who prefer other systems, such as Catholicism, for example, are considered bad Americans and are sure to be frowned on by the purists. Protestantism is the only national religion, and to ignore that fact is to view the country from a false angle.

Siegfried was fully aware of the denominational nature of Protestantism, yet still insisted on his main point: "In order to appreciate the influence of Protestantism in this confusion of sects, we must not look at it as a group of organized churches, for its strength lies in the fact that its spirit is national."²⁷ Sidney E. Mead has recently shown that the fusion of Protestantism with Americanism was especially evident in the later nineteenth century. He has suggested that "during the second half of the nineteenth century there occurred a virtual identification of the outlook of this denominational Protestantism with 'Americanism' or 'the American way of life' and that we are still living with some of the results of this ideological amalgamation of evangelical Protestantism with Americanism."²⁸ During and just after the first World War there was an intensification of this synthesis through an emphasis on "Christian Americanization," by which was meant growth toward national democratic and spiritual ideals, of which the churches were the best custodians.²⁹ One feature of this identification was illustrated in the Lynds' comment following their 1925 study of "Middletown": "In theory, religious beliefs dominate all other activities in Middletown."³⁰

The religious education movement, which was at the peak of its influence in the later 1920's, clearly illustrated the theme of the ideological amalgamation of religion and culture. Shailer Mathews pointed to its triumphs in 1927 by declaring that "it commands the same sort of enthusiastic following from idealistic young men and women as did sociology a generation ago. The most generally elected courses in theological seminaries, the greatest activity in churches are in its field."

But Mathews warned religious educators that they were tending to neglect the church in their concern for education, insisting that "it is our privilege to teach young people that religion has some other task than that of making good citizens and good neighbors."³¹ As H. Shelton Smith was later to document, many religious educators "sought to blend the democratic theory of education and the democratic theory of the Kingdom of God."³²

In view of this identification, it was inevitable that Protestantism would be deeply and directly influenced by trends within the culture, and that many of them would be accepted and even blessed by the churches. In 1929 the self-styled "puzzled parson," Charles Fiske, indicated that he was not quite as puzzled as he claimed to be when he said:

America has become almost hopelessly enamoured of a religion that is little more than a sanctified commercialism; it is hard in this day and this land to differentiate between religious aspiration and business prosperity. Our conception of God is that he is a sort of Magnified Rotarian. Sometimes, indeed, one wonders whether the social movement and the uplift in general have not become, among Protestants, a substitute for devotion; worse than that, a substitute for real religion. Efficiency has become the greatest of Christian virtues. I hope I may be forgiven a note of exaggeration that is necessary to make my meaning clear when I say that Protestantism, in America, seems to be degenerating into a sort of Babsonian cult, which cannot distinguish between what is offered to God and what is accomplished for the glory of America and the furtherance of business enterprise.³³

Edwin Lewis of Drew, reviewing in 1934 the course American Protestantism had taken during the previous twenty years, declared:

We borrowed our criteria of evaluation from the world about us—a world gone mad in its worship of mere size, a world that had set itself to create bigger ships, bigger aeroplanes, bigger locomotives, bigger buildings, bigger universities, bigger corporations, bigger banks, bigger everything—except men! . . . And we were guilty of the incredible folly of supposing that "Christ's church was of this world," to be judged by the world's standards, to be modeled on the world's ways, to walk in the world's procession, and to keep step to the crashing discord of its brazen shawms.³⁴

In the light of such identification with the culture, Protestantism could hardly avoid a share in the spiritual poverty of the time, or escape wholly from the spirit of disillusionment that swept American life in the 1920's. The American spiritual depression and the decline of Protestantism in the 1920's were intimately correlated.

It was on churches already seriously weakened, already in some decline, that the blow of economic depression fell. When the Lynds returned to Middletown ten years after their first study they found that "the city had been shaken for nearly six years by a catastrophe involving not only people's values but, in the case of many, their very existence. Unlike most socially generated catastrophes, in this case virtually nobody in the community had been cushioned against the blow;

the great knife of the depression had cut down impartially through the entire population, cleaving open the lives and hopes of rich as well as poor."³⁵ The great knife of depression also cut deep into church life. "Outwardly the churches suffered along with the rest of the nation," wrote Robert M. Miller, "Memberships dropped, budgets were slashed, benevolent and missionary enterprises set adrift, ministers fired, and chapels closed. All this can be demonstrated statistically."³⁶ The evidence need not be summarized here, but a single illustration of the impact of depression may be in order. In 1927 Shailer Mathews had reported the triumph of religious education; less than ten years later, after depression had done its work, Adelaide Teague Case painted a dark picture.

What shall we say to Christian Education today? Obviously it is in distress. The machinery has broken down. All the denominational boards of education have suffered great losses. The International Council of Religious Education is struggling on with a greatly reduced staff and budget. The Religious Education Association is in abeyance, trying to maintain itself with a handful of volunteers who are holding it together in spite of a staggering debt. Training schools and departments of religious education in universities and seminaries are severely reduced in size; some of them have reorganized or disappeared. The professional leadership is discouraged; directors of religious education are transferring to social work or public education or joining the ranks of the unemployed.³⁷

This illustration could be matched by pointing to many other aspects of the churches' programs. Hidden in such a flat statement as "twenty out of thirty-five leading denominations compared in 1934 had reduced their total expenditures by from thirty to fifty per cent and five over fifty per cent" are countless stories of struggles, discouragement, and tragedy.³⁸

I believe that this approach to religion in the depression, to distinguish between religious and economic depressions, throws light on many aspects of religious life in the 1930's, but on the following three in particular. First, one of the persistent questions of the depression period was "why no revival of religion?" Some religious leaders, reported Samuel Kincheloe, "actually hailed the depression with rejoicing since they had the idea that previous depressions had 'driven men to God' and felt that the time was overdue for men again to be reminded of the need to let the spiritual dominate the materialistic order."³⁹ At various times in the American past, depression and revival had been related, classically in 1857-1858. But when the distinction between religious and economic depression is made, it becomes clear that it was an already depressed Protestantism that was overtaken by the economic crisis. Without inner changes it was unable to deal with the needs of the time in a fresh and creative way. The changes that finally came did contribute to conspicuous currents of renewal, but only after the depression itself had passed.

Second, a significant aspect of the religious depression, perplexing to the major denominations, was the mushrooming of the newer and smaller religious groups, the sects. Detailed analyses of particular communities, such as Pope's study of Gastonia, the Lynds' probing of Middletown, and Boisen's samplings of several communities, all document the proliferation of the sects in the depression decade.⁴⁰ A number of observers have pointed out that many, probably a majority, of the supporters of sectarian movements were formerly adherents of the older and larger Protestant denominations. That the sects attracted many among the "disinherited" and economically depressed classes has been stated many times.⁴¹ A significant but indirect factor in the rapid growth of the sects in the 1930's would seem to be the internal Protestant depression with its consequent lack of clarity and energy in the churches. Individuals won from older to newer religious bodies often indicated their dissatisfaction with the coldness and formality of the old-line churches.

Third, one of the major shifts of mood which was certainly speeded by the lash of depression was the somewhat precipitous decline of the evangelical liberal theology, which had been so conspicuous a part of Protestant life in the first quarter of the century. There were some signs of the internal disintegration of liberalism even before the first world war.⁴² In 1925, Justin Wroe Nixon explained the liberal's dilemma in a forceful article in the *Atlantic*. While the liberals were fighting off the frontal attack of fundamentalism, he declared, they were inadvertently backing toward the humanist position; they were seriously embarrassed by the flank attack of the naturalists and humanists.⁴³ The latter claimed to speak for a scientifically and naturalistically-minded age far better than the liberals, who were accused of clinging to an unsatisfactory and unstable compromise, could. By the early 1930's, liberals were finding it increasingly difficult, in terms of their optimistic orientation and idealistic heritage, to deal satisfactorily with the realities of depression, the rise of totalitarianism, and the resurgence of barbarism on the world scene. In his famous article of 1933, "After Liberalism—What?" John C. Bennett said emphatically,

The most important fact about contemporary American theology is the disintegration of liberalism. Disintegration may seem too strong a word, but I am using it quite literally. It means that as a structure with a high degree of unity theological liberalism is coming to pieces. The liberal preacher has had a coherent pattern of theological assumptions in the background of his message. He has often had the kind of self-confidence which goes with the preaching of an orthodoxy, for liberalism has been a new orthodoxy in many circles. It is that coherent pattern of assumptions, that self-confidence, which are going. Now many of us are left with a feeling of theological homelessness.⁴⁴

Into the vacuum new theological currents immediately flowed, as interpreters of European dialectical theologies appeared.⁴⁵ Benson Y. Landis could report in 1933 that "the economic crisis seems to be breeding a theology of crisis."⁴⁶ But one must not press too hard the relationship between the depression and the decline of liberalism. It was not the depression alone, however, but the many crises of the 1930's which together weakened the liberal synthesis and made men receptive to new views. When the *Christian Century* published in 1939 its oft-quoted series of articles on "How My Mind Has Changed in This Decade," many of America's leading theologians told how the fateful events of the decade had led them to shift their position to a neo-liberalism if not a neo-orthodoxy. A characteristic expression of the impact of the decade on the liberals was penned by E. G. Homrighausen. "I saw evidences of man's lostness: the depression, the constant threat of war, the return to brutality on so vast a scale, the loss of the spiritual substance of life that alone gives society structure, the uncertainty and insecurity of life."⁴⁷

Somewhat paradoxically, for the rise of the social gospel had been intimately related to the earlier success of theological liberalism, there was clearly a resurgence of the social gospel in the 1930's, despite the decay of liberalism. The works of Paul A. Carter and Robert M. Miller, previously cited, document this resurgence of social concern abundantly; a hasty examination of denominational social pronouncements in the bleak decade provides convincing confirmation. Hornell Hart reported some years ago on this aspect of religion in the depression in these words:

The most striking increase in religious discussion in magazines has been in the field of Christian ethics. *Readers' Guide* entries under this heading and under "Church and Social Problems," "Christian Socialism," and "Christian Sociology" increased from 17 per 100,000 in 1929 to 140 in 1932, and in 1941 they were still more than twice their 1929 level. The rise and recession of this curve is notably similar to the rise and decline in the amount of unemployment and to other indices of the economic depression.⁴⁸

That there was something of a resurgence of the social gospel I do not doubt, but on the whole the resurgence of social interest in the 1930's is perhaps more to be seen as related to a permanent contribution which the social gospel in its creative days earlier in the century had made to the larger Protestant world: a sensitivity to social issues and an awareness of social need. A Protestantism which had been alerted by such a vigorous social movement could not easily be callous to serious social need. Not a few of those who took leadership in movements to the theological right were also conspicuous for their continued attention to social thought and action.

II

I have argued that Protestantism entered the period of religious and economic depression as the dominant American religious tradition, closely identified with the culture. But Protestantism emerged from depression no longer in such a position; it was challenged by forces outside the Protestant churches and questioned by some within. Siegfried, who identified Protestantism as the national religion as late as 1927, saw the trend of the times: "The worldliness of this Protestantism and its pretensions to be a national religion reserved for the privileged few have antagonized many of its followers as well as its adversaries. They feel that something is lacking, almost the spirit of religion itself; for the ultimate has been reduced until it embraces little more than ethics."⁴⁹ And though the Lynds had indicated that *in theory* religious beliefs dominated all other activities in Middletown, they hastened to add that "actually, large regions of Middletown's life appear uncontrolled by them."⁵⁰ In this period, the vast rural reservoirs of Protestant strength were rather rapidly being outmatched by the flooding cities. The Protestantism that threw itself so strongly behind prohibition in the 1920's was one in which the rural tradition was still very strong. Indeed, prohibition itself was in one sense part of the struggle of country against city. The legislative superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League recognized in 1917 that the Eighteenth Amendment had to pass before 1920, for with reapportionment would come, as he put it, "forty new wet Congressmen . . . from the great wet centers with their rapidly increasing population."⁵¹ The final failure of prohibition made it clearer to many Protestants that the familiar American culture in which they had flourished and with which they had been so closely identified was going. The comfortable identification with American cultural patterns no longer seemed so relevant or so helpful.

The beginnings of Protestant renewal, which Herbert Wallace Schneider notes as arising in the "dark 30's" and continuing as an "offensive which has grown steadily since then,"⁵² developed in part as religious leaders challenged the identification of Protestantism with American culture and summoned the church to recover its own independent standing-ground. In 1935, Harry Emerson Fosdick preached the famous sermon in which he appealed to Protestants to go "beyond modernism." He exclaimed,

And in that new enterprise the watchword will be not, Accommodate yourself to the prevailing culture! but, Stand out from it and challenge it! For this inescapable fact, which again and again in Christian history has called modernism to its senses, we face: we cannot harmonize Christ himself with modern culture. What Christ does to modern culture is to challenge it.⁵³

And in that same year, to cite another example, appeared a book with

the revealing title *The Church Against the World*. It vigorously protested the identification of the church with American culture. Francis P. Miller wrote, "The plain fact is that the domestication of the Protestant community in the United States within the framework of the national culture has progressed as far as in any western land. The degradation of the American Protestant church is as complete as the degradation of any other national Protestant church."⁵⁴ What the church should therefore do was stated by H. Richard Niebuhr in these words:

We live, it is evident, in a time of hostility when the church is imperiled not only by an external worldliness but by one that has established itself within the Christian camp. Our position is inside a church which has been on the retreat and which has made compromises with the enemy in thought, in organization, and in discipline. Finally, our position is in the midst of that increasing group in the church which has heard the command to halt, to remind itself of its mission, and to await further orders.⁵⁵

As James H. Smylie has analyzed the theological trend of a steadily enlarging group in American Protestantism, it was "a trend from an irrelevant attachment to society toward a relevant detachment to society without becoming irrelevantly detached from society."⁵⁶ The "Christ of culture" motif, which had long been of great significance in American Protestantism, was being challenged from within. From a widening circle of Protestants seeking to return again by one route or another to the independent sources of their faith, there came movements of renewal which marked the beginning of the end of the religious depression for Protestants. There were also other sources of renewal, but this one bears an especial relation to our theme.

I have entitled this paper the "American" religious depression because there was a nationally observable spiritual lethargy evident in the 1920's and 1930's, and because the then clearly dominant religious tradition of the country was in decline. Certainly both Judaism and Roman Catholicism were deeply affected by the economic depression; to what extent they were internally affected by spiritual depression the authorities on those bodies must say. Jewish congregations enjoyed a healthy growth in the 1926-36 decade, reporting a 13.7 per cent increase. Roman Catholicism also grew, but considerably more slowly than in the preceding ten year period. The church had then reported an 18.3 per cent growth, which dropped to 7 per cent for 1926-1936.⁵⁷ Perhaps this change was influenced both by the cutting off of immigration and by the generally unfriendly attitude toward religion. But neither Judaism or Catholicism was embarrassed by too close identification with the surrounding culture, for both felt their minority situation rather keenly. When George N. Shuster wrote his widely-read work on the Catholic spirit in America in 1927, he began by noting that "twenty or thirty

years ago ambition would have dictated silence about one's mere connection with what is termed the Roman Church. Today prudence still seems to suggest keeping this matter under cover as fully as possible.⁵⁸ But during the depression years a significant change took place; Protestantism declined and lost its sense of being the national religion, while Roman Catholicism, reflecting advances made during and after the war years, consolidated by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, rather quickly became more visible on the American scene. It was less than fifteen years from the time that Shuster wrote the words just quoted that the popular historian Theodore Maynard made this claim: "Protestantism—especially American Protestantism—is now so doctrinally decayed as to be incapable of offering any serious opposition to the sharp sword of the Spirit, as soon as we can make up our minds to use it. Except for isolated 'fundamentalists,'—and these are pretty thoroughly discredited and without intellectual leadership—Catholicism could cut through Protestantism as through so much butter."⁵⁹ The contrast between the two quotations dramatizes an important religious transition of the depression period. The upshot of that transition which focused in depression years, though it had been long in the making, was summarized by Will Herberg in his book, *Protestant-Catholic-Jew*:

In net effect, Protestantism today no longer regards itself either as a religious movement sweeping the continent or as a national church representing the religious life of the people; Protestantism understands itself today primarily as one of the three religious communities in which twentieth century America has come to be divided.⁶⁰

During the period of religious and economic depression, then, the "Protestant era" in America was brought to a close; Protestantism emerged no longer as the "national religion." The test of depression was a severe one; it laid bare certain weaknesses in American Protestantism. But the repudiation of the virtual identification of Protestantism with American culture by an able and growing group of religious leaders freed many Protestants to recover in a fresh way their own heritages and their original sources of inspiration. The depression stimulated many Protestants to seek new and deeper understandings of their own religious heritage, though this "positive" contribution of the depression to religion could probably be appreciated only later. The years of religious and economic depression were years of significant transition for the American churches, for in that period trends long in the making were dramatically revealed, and developments important to the future became visible.

1. *American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), p. 63.
2. "The Recovery of the Religious Sentiment," in Vergilius Ferm, ed., *Contemporary American Theology: Theological Autobiographies* (2 vols., New York: Round Table Press, 1932-1933), II, 367.
3. *Atlantic Monthly*, 143 (January-June, 1929), 378.
4. Fennell P. Turner and Frank Knight Sanders, eds., *The Foreign Missions Conference of North America . . . 1926* (New York: Foreign Missions Conference, 1926), pp. 125-47.
5. "Some Conditions in North America that Affect Foreign Missions," in Leslie B. Moss and Mabel H. Brown, eds., *The Foreign Missions Conference of North America . . . 1934* (New York: Foreign Missions Conference, 1934), p. 148.
6. *Research Memorandum on Religion in the Depression* (New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 33, 1937), p. 51.
7. Based on a study of the figures by the Rev. Donald A. Crosby, whose assistance in the research for this paper I acknowledge with thanks.
8. *Current History*, XXXIII (October, 1930), 25.
9. C. Luther Fry, "Changes in Religious Organizations," *Recent Social Trends* (2 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933), II, 1046.
10. Stanley High, "The Need for Youth," in Leslie B. Moss, ed., *The Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1929* (New York: Foreign Missions Conference, 1929), p. 152.
11. "What the Church Has to Say to Business Men About Foreign Missions," in Leslie B. Moss, ed., *The Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1928* (New York: Foreign Missions Conference, 1928), p. 85.
12. *Home Missions Council Annual Report . . . 1928* (New York: Home Missions Council, 1928), p. 80.
13. Kincheloe, *Research Memorandum*, pp. 133 f.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 51; *Recent Social Trends*, II, 1055.
15. *The U. S. Looks At Its Churches* (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1930), p. 58.
16. H. C. Weber, *Evangelism: A Graphic Survey* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), pp. 181 f. I have had the opportunity of seeing charts plotting the "evangelistic index" and summarizing membership trends prepared by the Rev. Harold Edgar Martin; in general they all show decline beginning about 1925 and not showing significant upturn until the middle 1930's.
17. *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1954), p. 70, quoting Ellis J. Hough, "Terrors of the Protestant Ministry," *Presbyterian Advance*, XL (Jan. 30, 1930), 18.
18. *American Protestantism and Social Issues*, p. 47.
19. *The Confessions of a Puzzled Parson* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), p. 191.
20. *Does Civilization Need Religion? A Study in the Social Resources and Limitations of Religion in Modern Life* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), p. 2.
21. "What Happened to the Progressive Movement in the 1920's," *American Historical Review*, 64 (1959), 833. See also the perceptive article by Henry F. May, "Shifting Perspectives in the 1920's," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 43 (1956), 405-27.
22. *Theism and the Modern Mood* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1930), p. 6.
23. *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1953), p. 196.
24. *Belief Unbound: A Promethean Religion for the Modern World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), p. 20.
25. *The Modern Temper: A Study and A Confession* (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1929), pp. 191 f.
26. Hornell Hart, "Changing Social Attitudes and Interests," *Recent Social Trends*, I, 403.
27. *America Comes of Age* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1927), trans. by H. H. Hemming and Doris Hemming, pp. 33, 38f.
28. "American Protestantism Since the Civil War. I. From Denominationalism to Americanism," *Journal of Religion*, XXXVI (1956), 1.
29. Cf. Chap. III, "Christian Americanization," of my *We Witness Together: A History of Cooperative Home Missions* (New York: Friendship Press, 1956) pp. 64-82.
30. Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, *Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1929), p. 406.
31. "Let Religious Education Beware!" *Christian Century*, 44 (1927), 362.
32. *Faith and Nurture* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941), p. 41.
33. *Confessions of a Puzzled Parson*, p. 14.
34. *A Christian Manifesto* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1934), p. 202.
35. Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, *Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1937), p. 295.

36. *American Protestantism and Social Issues*, p. 63.
37. "Christian Education," in Samuel McCrea Cavert and Henry P. Van Dusen, eds., *The Church Through Half a Century: Essays in Honor of William Adams Brown* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), pp. 243 f.
38. H. Paul Douglass and Edmund deS. Brunner, *The Protestant Church as a Social Institution* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1935), p. 208.
39. *Research Memorandum*, p. 1.
40. Liston Pope, *Millhands and Preachers: A Study of Gastonia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), pp. 126, 128; *Middletown in Transition*, p. 297; Anton T. Boisen, "Religion and Hard Times," *Social Action*, V. (March 15, 1939), 8-35.
41. E.g., cf. Boisen, *loc. cit.*; Elmer T. Clark, *The Small Sects in America* (rev. ed.; New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949), pp. 16-20, 218 f., 230.
42. Walter Marshall Horton, *Realistic Theology* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1934), p. 35.
43. "The Evangelicals' Dilemma," *Atlantic Monthly*, 136 (July-December, 1925), 368-74.
44. *Christian Century*, 50 (1933), 1403.
45. Cf. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, "Continental Influence on American Christian Thought Since World War I," *Church History*, XXVII (1958), 256-72.
46. "Organized Religion," *American Journal of Sociology* 38 (July, 1932-May, 1933), 907.
47. "Calm After Storm," *Christian Century*, 56 (1939), 479.
48. "Religion," *American Journal of Sociology*, 47 (July 1941-May, 1942), 894.
49. *America Comes of Age*, p. 46.
50. *Middletown*, p. 406.
51. Wayne Wheeler, as quoted by Paul A. Carter, *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel*, p. 37.
52. *Religion in 20th Century America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), p. 18.
53. "Beyond Modernism: A Sermon," *Christian Century*, 52 (1935), 1552.
54. H. Richard Niebuhr, Wilhelm Pauck, and Francis P. Miller, *The Church Against the World* (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Co., 1935), p. 102.
55. *Ibid.*, pp. 1 f.
56. "The American Protestant Churches and the Depression of the 1930's" (Th.M. Thesis, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1950), p. 125.
57. Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1936, I* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1941), 51.
58. *The Catholic Spirit in America* (New York: Lincoln Mac Veagh, The Dial Press, 1927), p. vii.
59. *The Story of American Catholicism* (New York: Macmillan, 1941), p. 613.
60. *Protestant-Catholic-Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1955), pp. 139 f.

ANNOUNCEMENT

A new feature is planned for this journal under the title, **ACTIVITIES AND PROJECTS**. The purpose is to inform readers about conferences, research, and major enterprises of publication of interest to church historians. Items may be sent in as announcements of forthcoming events, descriptions of work in progress, or reports on results. Deadlines are March 20, June 20, September 20, and December 20. Members are invited to send brief statements (subject to necessary editing) to F. A. Norwood, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois. Items of personal nature and individual book notices should not be sent.

SOME ASPECTS OF EARLY BOURBON POLICY TOWARD THE HUGUENOTS¹

GEORGE A. ROTHROCK, JR., *University of Omaha*

The golden age of French Protestantism, insofar as *de jure* recognition is concerned, extends from Henry IV's religious settlement in 1598 to the important modification of that settlement by Louis XIII in 1629. These years witnessed important developments both within the Protestant movement and in the relations between that movement and the French crown.

The religious settlement of 1598, usually known as the Edict of Nantes, deserves a closer scrutiny than it has thus far received. It was a settlement based upon the treaties and edicts of pacification of the preceding forty years, a mass of religious legislation which was often contradictory as it was the result of the varying fortunes of civil war. In attempting to draw a moderate compromise from these conflicting elements the Edict of Nantes contented neither Catholics nor Huguenots. The apparent recognition of Protestantism as a permanent force in French society was abhorrent to the former, while the limitations it imposed upon Protestant worship were deemed humiliating by the latter.

Actually there was no foundation for a religious peace in France since both the Catholics and the Huguenots still hoped for a total victory. The Catholics had not yet learned the futility of trying to enforce conformity, and the Protestants still aspired to equality with the established church. Neither party had any clear conception of political possibilities. Toleration in France was a royal notion, and the religious settlement was dependent upon the continued support of the crown.

Henry IV had no alternative to granting the Edict of Nantes. His former co-religionists were too strong to be coerced into following his conversion and too militant to be ignored.² Since internal peace was a necessary precondition of Henry's program for the re-establishment of the royal authority, the only solution was a limited toleration enforced by the crown.³ Since the royal armies could not be everywhere at once this necessitated allowing the Protestants both legal rights and the means of defending them. These two facets of Henry IV's religious settlement were dictated by necessity. The means by which he effected them clearly indicate, however, that he had no intention of creating for the Protestants a permanent independence of the crown.

The Edict of Nantes was divided into two parts, the first containing 92 general articles and the second 56 secret articles.⁴ Though the edict did not give the Protestants equality with the Catholics it immeasurably improved their situation. Protestants were to be allowed the public exercise of their faith, the enjoyment of public office, the control and education of their children, and decent burial. They might reside in any part of the kingdom and might perform the public acts of their religion in certain specified areas. Moreover, special courts were created in which the presence of Protestant judges gave them cause to hope for more equitable justice. They still had to pay the tithes for the support of the national (Catholic) church, but this was compensated by a royal subsidy for the support of their ministers and schools. The Huguenots' rights were limited, but at least they were defined, and they could look to royal courts on which sat members of their own faith for protection of those rights.

The issue of the Edict of Nantes exposed Henry IV to severe criticisms from Rome, from the French Catholic clergy,⁵ and from his *parlements*.⁶ These he stilled by judicious concessions, and by the time the concessions proved empty the moment for protest had passed.

It is not surprising that the Catholics received the Edict of Nantes with some indignation and opposition, but even the Protestant governing bodies showed little gratitude. They had complained that the edict in its original form did not go far enough. After Henry's concessions to its opponents they were even less enthusiastic and continually agitated for its re-issue in its original form. Not only were they dissatisfied with the scope of the edict but they even lacked the grace to thank the king for the very considerable efforts which he had made on their behalf against the determined Catholic opposition.

This unenthusiastic reception by the governing bodies of the Protestant churches was indicative of a real division between the moderate desires of the great mass of the Huguenots and the extremist sympathies of the ministers who controlled their councils, a division accentuated by the greater freedom which the edict introduced. The moderates could no longer be goaded to "fight or die," and the desire for office, or simply for a quiet life such as the edict made possible, encouraged many to accept the settlement gratefully. Thus, as Henry had foreseen,⁷ the strength of the Huguenots, which had been the chief reason for drafting the edict, was undermined by the very settlement which it evoked.

It must be noted, however, that the Edict of Nantes contains no reference either to "places of security" or to a royal subsidy for the support of Protestant garrisons. These privileges, which formed the other half of Henry's concessions to the Protestants, were granted by

letters patent.⁸ The distinction is important. The Edict of Nantes was registered by the *parlements* of France as "fundamental and irrevocable law." Thus Henry tried to guarantee the permanency of his settlement. The military privileges bore no such "fundamental and irrevocable" guarantee and were regarded by the king as a temporary solution to the problem of preventing Catholic extremists from attempting to take matters into their own hands. The letters patent of 1598 granting "places of security" set a time limit of eight years. In 1606 Henry renewed the privilege for five years more, and in 1611 Marie de Médicis, who was then regent, granted another five year extension. It was only by periodic renewals of a limited grant that the Protestants held their fortified towns until 1629.⁹

The temporary character of the privileges which the Huguenots considered among their most important is indicative of the king's attitude toward the movement. Henry IV had no desire to see Protestantism spread; rather, he would doubtless have been pleased if it had slowly died out. He made the concessions necessary to civil peace and did his utmost to enforce their observance upon the Catholics, but he clearly assumed that his protection of the Protestants removed their excuse for the maintenance of a strong military and political organization. The frequency of his consent to Protestant political assemblies and the amount of his subsidy to their garrisons diminished continually as his ability to enforce his will in the provinces increased.¹⁰ The royal policy toward the Huguenots from 1598 to 1610 is a complex of compromises and concessions that gradually reduced their political effectiveness. Henry was willing to allow meetings of the National Synod, which dealt only with matters of doctrine and discipline unless otherwise instructed by the crown, but the only regular political organization which he permitted the Protestants was the two-man deputation which they maintained at court to represent their interests.

The position of the Huguenots by 1610 was quite different from what it had been in 1598. Their military resources had been lessened by twelve years of peace and the diminution of the royal subsidy; their political solidarity had been weakened by the king's continued opposition to political assemblies; and the differences between the fanatics and the moderates had been heightened by the conciliation of the latter. On the whole French Protestantism was much more dependent upon the support of the crown in 1610. The assassination of Henry IV made many fear for the permanence of that support.

The Huguenots had sometimes complained of Henry, but they had regarded him as their protector and had felt safe while he lived. They were suspicious of his Italian queen and her coterie of Italian prelates

and Jesuits whom they accused of being regicides. The encouragement given Spanish marriage proposals was regarded as a sign of an approaching attempt to extinguish Protestantism, and there was even talk of another St. Bartholomew's Day. The duc de Sully shut himself up in the fortress of the Bastille, of which he was governor, and only after great difficulty was the queen able to persuade him to come out the next day. He attempted to excuse himself on the grounds of an illness and also claimed he had been warned of plots against him at the Louvre.¹¹ When Marie sent assurances that the rumors of plots were false and that she would receive him with all honors he quickly recovered from his "illness" and called upon her to offer his services as his high position required of him. Even Duplessis Mornay was disturbed about the future of the Protestant church. He emphasized the danger from the Jesuits¹² and maintained that if the queen succeeded in her conciliatory policy it would be in spite of her advisors.¹³

Actually the Protestants need not have been so fearful. The regent had no desire to stir them up, for she was expecting trouble from the nobility and the princes of the blood. She received Sully graciously and continued him in office, and within a week after Henry's death she issued a confirmation of the Edict of Nantes to calm those who feared another St. Bartholomew's Day.¹⁴ Before six months had passed she even authorized another General Assembly, a concession which the Huguenots had been able to wring from the late king only with great difficulty.¹⁵

The regency period was critical in the development of French Protestantism. Early in 1611 a combination of ministers and great nobles forced the resignation of Sully from the government.¹⁶ The finance minister, who had been the recognized leader of the Huguenot party, had been as much a royalist as a Protestant. His resignation from public affairs, followed by a withdrawal to the semi-seclusion of his estates and provincial interests, was to prove a loss both to the crown and to his co-religionists in the ensuing years. The moderate Duplessis Mornay remained the sage elder statesman of the party, but he lacked the gift of leadership, and Sully's withdrawal left a void which was never really filled. The two contenders for his position as the acknowledged political leader of the Huguenots were the duc de Rohan, his son-in-law, and the duc de Bouillon. The former, though a political and military leader of no mean ability, lacked the experience and tempering of the generation which had served Henry IV, and the latter was a self-seeking time-server.

The Assembly of Saumur,¹⁷ which the queen permitted in 1611, though its efforts were sterile, was in some ways a landmark in the development of French Protestantism. The government approached

Bouillon with offers of rewards for good service, and he promised "to go as far as his honor and his conscience would permit."¹⁸ Thereafter he encouraged his co-religionists' agitation in order to cause uneasiness at the court and make it easier for him to set a high price on his services as mediator. Bouillon's servility to the regent and his obvious personal ambition cost him much of his support, however, and with Sully's backing Rohan emerged from the assembly as the new Protestant champion. Since he was distrusted by the government this turn of events in no way improved relations between the Protestants and the crown.

Huguenot-crown relations were worsened by the behavior of the deputies to the assembly.¹⁹ Despite the regent's conciliatory policy the assembly demanded privileges and concessions surpassing anything that Henry IV had ever permitted, notably the right to name unequivocally the two deputies general who would reside at the court and immediate redress of grievances before the dissolution of the assembly.²⁰ Richelieu's later statement that the Protestants were attempting to fish in the troubled waters of the regency, though hardly objective, appears to be a fair estimate of the situation.

Largely through the efforts of Bouillon the extravagant claims of the assembly were defeated, but there remained a bitterness on both sides. The queen's answers to the deputies' demands showed, however, that she still preferred compromises and concessions to open conflict. She renewed the grant of the security towns for another five years, promised to pay the full costs of the garrisons, authorized the repair of fortifications, and promised an increase in the subsidy for their ministers. Many requests were refused, and the assembly was undeniably defeated in its attempt to win two important concessions, direct nomination of deputies general and immediate redress of grievances, but it had won the confirmation of the privileges which the Huguenots considered essential to their security. Furthermore, the meeting had allowed the Protestants to complete their political organization, for throughout the dispute with the government the deputies were at the same time attending to the internal problems of the Protestant churches. Among the more important administrative reforms were the establishment of more provincial councils to serve as interim executive committees between the meetings of the provincial assemblies, and the creation of "circles" of three or four neighboring provinces to act when disputes arose between provinces or when the resources of a single province were insufficient for an undertaking of importance to the Protestant cause.²¹ These two modifications further coordinated the activities of the more militant Huguenots and strengthened the unity of the

whole movement. After 1611 relations between the crown and the Protestants resembled an armed truce.

Through the later years of the regency the situation worsened. An attempt by the government to weaken Rohan in his government of S. Jean d'Angeli through interference with the municipal elections proved abortive when he succeeded in presenting the issue to his party as a test case for the new local organizations and was supported by the Circle of La Rochelle.²² The fear that the Protestants would join the rebellious Prince de Condé and the discontented nobles stayed the government's hand from any punitive action, and Rohan emerged from the struggle stronger and more antagonistic than before. Actually prudence and a healthy distrust of Condé's motives were all that restrained the more radical elements of the party from joining the prince in his revolt in 1614, and even these restraints tended to break down as relations with the government continually deteriorated.

The militant Protestantism of the teens and twenties was far different in character, however, from that of the late sixteenth century. First, the party, in a military action, could count upon fewer effectives since it was unlikely that the moderates would jeopardize a considerably improved position for the sake of new concessions which appealed only to the more fanatical.²³ Secondly, it no longer enjoyed the leadership of a soldier of the stature of Henry of Navarre. Finally, the accomplishment of "the Spanish marriages" in 1615, between young Louis XIII and the *infanta* Anne and Louis' sister and the crown prince of Spain, created the disturbing possibility that the French crown might enlist Spanish aid against rebellious heretics.²⁴

The Protestant revolts of the twenties were dangerous, but the resources of the government were growing while those of the Huguenots were diminishing. The last great trial came in the revolt of La Rochelle, and the successful siege by the king's armies cast the Protestants upon the mercy of the crown. The Peace of Alais of 1629, which concluded the revolt, should be regarded as the final section of the Edict of Nantes, not as the first step toward its revocation, for the policy of Louis XIII toward the Protestants was completely in accord with that of his father.

Henry IV had no great sympathy for the aspirations of his former co-religionists after his coronation, and certainly he had no intention of establishing their independence. He reduced their subsidies; he tried to abolish their political assemblies; and doubtless he, too, would one day have refused to continue their military privileges. It is doubtful if he would have waited longer than was necessary either for the Catholics to accept a limited toleration of the Huguenots or for the crown to amass the strength necessary to defeat the Protestant armies and

then to defend the Protestants, after their defeat, against Catholic animosities. His death left the accomplishment of his policy to his son, and the course which Louis XIII followed could hardly have pleased him more.

By the Peace of Alais the Protestants lost their fortified cities, their armies, and all their military and territorial privileges, but their civil and religious liberties were not molested. The Edict of Nantes, the "fundamental and irrevocable law" registered by Henry IV's *parlements*, was not violated. Instead, two letters patent, granting distinctly temporary privileges, were revoked. The king withdrew from his rebellious subjects privileges which he judged they had misused.

The Protestant policies of Henry IV, of Marie de Médicis, and of Louis XIII were quite consistent. They aimed neither at encouraging the Huguenots nor at persecuting them. Rather, all three rulers sought a compromise which would serve the double purpose of maintaining civil peace and keeping the royal prerogative intact. Henry IV is to be admired not so much for the broad-minded tolerance often attributed to him as for the political sagacity which enabled him to create a compromise settlement stable enough to survive even the vicissitudes of a turbulent regency. It was the statecraft rather than the idealism of this first Bourbon king that created one of the bases for the seventeenth century consolidation of the French monarchy.

1. All references throughout this essay are to the most accessible copies of the documents in question. Many of the speeches, letters, and proclamations circulated as pamphlets, and originals of many of these may be found in the collections of the Newberry Library and the library of the University of Minnesota.
2. Henry's grasp of this point is evident in his letter of August 17, 1598, to the duc de Luxembourg. An extract of the pertinent parts of the letter may be found in the *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de protestantisme français*, vol. II, 1853, p. 30.
3. Henry used this argument himself. See his addresses to the *Parlement* of Paris on February 7 and February 16, 1599. Reprinted *ibid.*, pp. 128-136.
4. The most accessible copy of the Edict of Nantes is in Isambert and Taillandier, *Recueil général des anciennes lois françaises*, vol. XV, 1829, pp. 170-210.
5. The clergy rebuked the king vehemently, even those who held positions dependent upon the crown and might, therefore, have been expected to be more docile. See, for example, the letter of the Cardinal d'Ossat, French Ambassador to Rome, to Henry IV, in the *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de protestantisme français*, vol. XLVII, 1898, pp. 284-285. The letter is also reprinted in translation in Henry M. Baird, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, 1886, vol. II, pp. 431-433.
6. Through deputations, remonstrances, and delays the *Parlement* of Paris resisted the edict for ten months before it finally registered it. The provincial *parlements* then attempted the same thing, but the king treated them curtly and commanded them to obey the royal pleasure, whereupon most of them submitted quickly. The most recalcitrant of the *parlements*, however, that of Rouen, continued its resistance and did not register the edict without restrictions until 1609.
7. The king clearly predicted such a development in a speech in 1597. See the excerpt in J. S. Will, *Protestantism in France*, 1921, vol. II, p. 10.
8. The whole of the Settlement of Nantes, consisting of both parts of the edict and the two letters patent, may be found in Elie Benoist, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, vol. I, "Recueil d'édits, conférences, et autres pièces," 1693, pp. 62-98.

9. The Peace of Montpellier of 1622, which concluded a Protestant revolt, reduced the number of fortified towns to two, La Rochelle and Montauban.
10. By 1610 the amount of the subsidy had fallen from 180,000 écus to 50,000 écus. J.-H. Mariéjol, *Histoire de France, 1598-1643*, E. Lavissee gen. ed., 1911, p. 150. He tried to make an end to the General (political) Assemblies in 1599, in 1601, in 1605, and again in 1608.
11. Sully, Maximilien de Béthune, due de, *Sages et royales oeconomies d'estat*, Michaud and Poujoulat, eds., *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, series 2, vol. III, 1837, p. 383.
12. Letter of May 18, 1610, to M. de Thou. *Mémoires et Correspondence de Duplessis-Mornay*, vol. XI, 1825, p. 29.
13. Letter of May 21, 1610, to the due de Bouillon. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
14. Reprinted in Jean de Serres, *Inventaire général de l'histoire de France*, 1643, p. 879.
15. Rohan, Henri, due de, *Mémoires*, (ed. of 1667), vol. II, p. 4.
16. Sully gave his resignation on January 26, 1611.
17. The assembly was originally called for Châtellerault, but a brevet of May 2, 1611, transferred it to Saumur. Châtellerault was within the provincial government of Sully while Saumur was in that of Duplessis Mornay. At the time of the first authorization Sully was still in favor. After his retirement the queen feared his dissatisfaction, and the transfer of the assembly was probably an attempt to neutralize his influence. Duplessis Mornay was a moderate whom she trusted. Both the brevet convoking the assembly to Châtellerault and that transferring it to Saumur may be found in the *Mercure François*, vol. II, 1614, pp. 163-164.
18. Rohan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 9.
19. The assembly numbered about 70 elected deputies representing the fifteen Protestant provinces of France and Béarn, the two deputies general, and some Protestant nobles present by invitation, making a total of about 82. *Mercure François*, vol. II, 1614, p. 165. Men of the calibre of Duplessis Mornay were outnumbered by fanatics from the provinces, but the Sully-Bouillon groups stalemated each other with the result that the presidency of the assembly fell upon Duplessis Mornay.
20. Henry IV had always insisted that the Huguenots submit to him a list of six names from which he would select the two deputies general and had refused on more than one occasion to permit the assemblies to nominate the two deputies directly as they attempted to do in 1611. Redress of grievances before the assembly was dissolved was a bold demand since such a privilege would make it possible for the assembly to put more coercive pressure upon the crown. Even the Estates General had never won this privilege. The complete cahier of the grievances and requests of the deputies circulated as a pamphlet. It was reprinted *ibid.*, pp. 185-198, and in Duplessis Mornay, *op. cit.*, pp. 231-246. It was reprinted with the queen's replies in Rohan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 69-105.
21. These arrangements were included in the *Règlement général* drawn up by the Assembly. It has been reprinted in Rohan, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 57-66.
22. Rohan's own account of the affair may be found *ibid.*, pp. 22-32. There is also a short account in Richelieu, A. J. du Plessis, cardinal et due de, *Histoire de la mère et du fils*, (ed. of 1730), vol. I, pp. 195 et seq.
23. This internal division of the Protestants was demonstrated many times, most notably in the autumn of 1615 concerning the question whether the Protestant armies would support Condé in his most recent rebellion. Unanimity was, in fact, never obtained, for when the General Assembly then meeting at Nîmes ordered rebellion only three provinces—Languedoc, Guienne, and Poitou—answered the call to arms, and even within these provinces several towns, including the important fortress of Montpellier, refused to join the insurrection. At the same time one of the king's Protestant officers, the Marshal Lesdiguières, offered to raise 6,000 men in the heavily Protestant Dauphiné for service against the rebels.
24. An alliance was signed on the same day as the marriage treaties by which each crown was bound to bring 6,000 infantry and 1,200 cavalry to the other's aid in case of need. F. T. Perrens, *Les Mariages Espagnols sous le règne de Henri IV et la régence de Marie de Médicis*, 1869, p. 349.

THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE TORY-ANGLICAN ALLIANCE IN THE STRUGGLE FOR CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

CLYDE J. LEWIS, *Eastern Kentucky State College*

The late 1820's, particularly the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, marked the end of an era in the history of the English Established Church. Earlier, for more than a century, the Anglican hierarchy had served as an appendage of the political system dominated by the landed interests; and since the younger Pitt's time, the Church had functioned politically as an ally of the Tory Party. By the year 1827, however, churchmen faced a rapidly changing political environment. Lord Liverpool's retirement removed the man who had manipulated the party machinery for more than two decades and left the various Tory factions fighting among themselves. The resulting disunity was one of the most significant factors in English politics during the years immediately before the Reform Bill of 1832; for even though the Tory fortress was besieged from without, its defense was complicated by dissension among the defenders. The following pages deal primarily with one aspect of this factional rivalry, as it was demonstrated by the rift between Anglican clergymen and Tory political leaders during the controversy over the religious legislation of 1828-29.¹

Catholic Emancipation was the issue which furnished the first definite hint that some Anglican principles might be sacrificed by the Tory politicians. For years, Catholics in England and Ireland had been agitating for removal of the old disability laws which prohibited them from holding public office and sitting in parliament. Even among the Tories, a pro-Catholic wing, led by George Canning, had shown mild opposition to the official party-line of the pro-Anglican wing led by Lord Eldon. While Liverpool was Prime Minister, he had managed to bridge the gap between the two factions; his absence in the government after 1827 weakened the compromising influences and encouraged the extremists on each side to suspect their rivals.

The creation of a new government after Liverpool's retirement precipitated a mild crisis, which greatly stimulated Anglican alarm. The King would have delighted in an ultra-Tory ministry, but neither the Duke of Wellington nor Sir Robert Peel could manage a possible pro-Catholic majority in the House of Commons. Thus the task of forming a new government had to be entrusted to Canning. The new appointment meant a virtual revolution. As Canning came in, the old Tories, led by Wellington, Sir Robert Peel, and Eldon, offered their resignations. The new Prime Minister was forced to look everywhere, even to

the Whigs, for cooperation in organizing a ministry. A host of anti-Anglicans answered his call, including among the most prominent, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Holland, Lord Brougham, and even the ex-radical, Sir Francis Burdett. This partial disintegration of the Tory Party was particularly ominous for churchmen who could still well remember Canning's pro-Catholic sympathies. Among staunch Anglicans, the general rumor was whispered about that Canning meant to use Church patronage for the appointment of pro-Catholic bishops and deans.²

Faced with these rising Anglican fears, the King made feeble attempts to reassure his Anglican supporters, but his efforts only complicated an already involved situation. He first called in the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Manners-Sutton, and the Bishop of London, Dr. Howley.³ To them, he confided his hatred of the Catholics, his determination to have a Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, and his assurance that the Canning ministry was pledged to neutrality on the Catholic question.⁴ The Archbishop was encouraged to report this interview in the House of Lords, but he decided to keep silent rather than precipitate a constitutional crisis. Meanwhile, some of the ultra-Tories were becoming suspicious of the King's intentions. Their apprehensions were expressed in a motion, presented in the upper House by the Tory Lord Mansfield, which demanded that the King declare his Protestant sympathies. The effects of this action were electrifying. The King wrote an angry letter to the Archbishop, and Manners-Sutton immediately reassured Mansfield privately of the King's determination to oppose Catholic Emancipation.⁵

No one can tell what might have come out of this political chaos, had it not been ended by Canning's death in August of 1827. When a new Canningite ministry under Lord Goderich failed miserably to command the situation, the King finally called upon Wellington and Peel. For a little while, high Anglicans could breathe easier. The Duke had always been a defender of the Church. Moreover, Peel had won his seat for the University of Oxford by his opposition to Catholic Emancipation.⁶ Churchmen, therefore, had good reason to believe that the Catholic question would be firmly ignored by the new government.

Such wishful thinking, however, could not eliminate the serious Irish problem. A brief lull in Irish unrest after 1825 had been followed by an even more determined agitation. The next year found Catholic orators, led by Daniel O'Connell, haranguing the provinces, despite the law forbidding meetings of the Catholic Association, which had been formed in 1823 for the promotion of Catholic Emancipation. The general election of 1826 saw the Association carry its campaign to the polls in the counties of Waterford and Louth. Before the astonished eyes

of their Protestant landlords, Catholic tenants, who had always supported their masters' candidates, voted for the men designated by the Association. This successful demonstration drove the lesson of Ireland home to participants on both sides of the controversy. Members of the Association took new heart in the realization of what might be accomplished.⁷ On the other hand, neither Wellington nor Peel was absolutely sure that the government could prevent some measure of Catholic relief.⁸

In addition to the Irish problem, increasing agitation among Dissenters faced the new government. By 1827, a popular movement for repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, firmly supported by Unitarians, Baptists, and Independents, had produced a council of representatives, organized for the purpose of applying pressure upon Parliament. A more opportune time could not have been chosen. Already, the Catholics and their supporters were showing signs of making common cause with the Dissenters in a crusade for religious liberty, a culmination which enlightened Tories could only contemplate with alarm for the Anglican Church.

But despite immediate advantages to be gained by placating Dissenters, the typical churchman was still very much opposed to giving up the sacramental test or granting other concessions. The repeated petitions from Unitarians were still solidly opposed by learned prelates like Dr. Burgess, Bishop of Salisbury, and Dr. Van Mildert, Bishop of Durham, who delivered charges to their clergy, proclaiming the dangers from Dissent.⁹ Even the moderate Dr. Lloyd, Bishop of Oxford, cautioned Peel against giving way on the issue in the House of Commons, and later, when it began to be clear that some concessions would have to be made, he was careful to warn Sir Robert against surrendering without consultation with the bishops.¹⁰

While the subject was thus being debated, Lord John Russell introduced his motion for repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in the House of Commons. Beneath his banner, the religious liberals, the anti-Anglicans, and the opposition Whigs found common cause, all hoping that the Tory government would thoroughly discredit itself by declaring against a popular measure. As spokesman for the government in the lower house, Peel was unwilling to face the issue on principle, and despite his most skillful maneuvering, the bill passed in Commons.¹¹ Fortunately for the Tories, Sir Robert had not involved the government so far as to preclude compromise. He could still hope to maintain the Tory position by carrying repeal in the House of Lords.

With this in mind, Peel asked Lloyd's help in gaining support from the bishops. Commons had already passed a bill repealing the Test and

Corporation Acts. Would it be to the advantage of the Church if the Lords held out for a flat rejection?¹² When the Bishop's reply to this question admitted that some concessions would probably be advisable, a meeting was arranged with the leading prelates to discuss the issue. On March 15, 1828, Peel met at Lambeth with the two archbishops, the Bishop of Llandaff, the Bishop of Durham, the Bishop of London, and the Bishop of Chester. They decided upon a declaration, binding the prospective office holder to support the Establishment, which they would accept as a substitute for the sacramental test and which could apparently be carried against extreme Dissenting influences in the House of Commons. A week later, at another meeting, the leading bishops agreed to support the Dissenters' bill in the House of Lords, if it contained the declaration.¹³ By these agreements, Sir Robert evidently succeeded in reassuring the bishops and avoiding an ugly debate—a debate which could promise only trouble for the Anglican Church and the Tory Party.

Still, there were plain indications that the bishops were not satisfied. As the time drew nearer when they would be called upon to carry out the policy, Peel was plagued with their rising fears. Lloyd continued to write from Oxford, cautioning Sir Robert against recognizing all sects as equal before the law. Such an admission, Lloyd believed, would not only be unconstitutional, it would also lead logically to the disestablishment of the Church.¹⁴ Van Mildert, who had never quite contented himself with abandoning the test, was also manifestly alarmed lest the bishops be accused of retreating under government pressure.¹⁵ These were only two reflections of the uneasiness felt by clergymen all over the country.

When the bill came up for debate in the House of Lords, the bishops' concern was clearly evidenced. They were not at all pleased to note how firmly the measure was supported on principle by their traditional liberal enemies, Lansdowne and Holland, and their suspicions were increased by a number of pro-Catholic petitions in favor of the bill.¹⁶ As each prelate rose to speak, he was inclined to qualify any remark which might be interpreted as a concession to the principle of religious equality.¹⁷ All of their efforts were far overshadowed by the speech of Bishop Van Mildert, who grudgingly confessed that he was not sure that the test should be retained but emphasized his determination that the church should not be subverted.¹⁸ By such statements, the leading Anglican prelates sought to warn Dissenters in advance that civil equality for non-Anglicans should not be misconstrued as a natural right.

Their straddling policy first brought the bishops into collision with the ultra-Tories. The House had hardly gone into committee for con-

sideration of the bill before Eldon and Dr. Blomfield, the Bishop of Chester, were in a heated argument over a proposal to exempt Anglican clergymen from the declaration agreed upon by the bishops.¹⁹ This minor brush was followed by a wordy squabble over Eldon's efforts to insert an oath in place of the declaration. Again, Blomfield was forced to speak against the ultra-Tories, and he was supported by Dr. Law, the Bishop of Bath and Wells.²⁰ When the oath was finally voted down by a considerable majority, Eldon proposed a clause to be included in the declaration, requiring the prospective office holder to affirm his Protestantism. Here was a new temptation for those prelates who were generally dissatisfied with the official Tory policy. Bishop Law and Bishop Van Mildert were quick to snap at the bait.²¹ Their apparently harmless deflection was a serious threat to Peel's parliamentary strategy of placating the opposition in Commons and avoiding a split in the Tory-Anglican faction. The policy now appeared doomed if Dissenters and religious liberals were to be further antagonized. With this danger in mind, the Bishops of Lincoln, Chester, and Gloucester hastened to oppose their brother prelates.²² Before the amendment was finally defeated it had created more ill will between the Eldonian Tories and Peel's followers among the bishops.

Alienation of the ultra-Tories was dangerous enough for the Church but in addition the bishops' wavering policy increased resentment among liberals. Early in the debates a Tory Lord suggested that the bill deny office to atheists and infidels. Accordingly, Dr. Copleston, the Bishop of Llandaff, moved that a clause be inserted into the declaration, binding the prospective office holder "on the true faith of a Christian."²³ Immediate protests arose from Lord Holland and the liberals, who pointed out that the new provision would exclude Jews from public office. Copleston, Eldon, and even Wellington defended the amendment with arguments which demonstrated that they were still dedicated to the principle of religious exclusion.²⁴ But their explanations did not satisfy the liberals, who entered a formal protest against Anglican religious intolerance.

After Copleston's insertion had been accepted, the bill was brought to a vote and carried. Unfortunately, however, Peel's earlier hope of unanimous agreement among the bishops was not realized. To be sure, the most influential prelates, including both archbishops and the Bishops of Chester, Llandaff, and London, stuck by their guns, but a considerable number of prelates voted with the minority. The Bishop of Bath and Wells, who participated in the early debates with a speech denouncing the sacramental test, changed his mind after Eldon's failure to include in the bill a provision specifically prohibiting Catholics from holding office. Van Mildert finally decided that the measure was too

dangerous and cast his vote in opposition. Bishop Marsh, of Peterborough, and Bishop Burgess, of Salisbury, also defied their reforming Tory leadership, along with a number of others, including the Bishops of Bristol, Ely, St. Asaph, and Exeter.²⁵ Although the spiritual Lords voted 13-8 for repeal, their obvious disagreement and the patronizing nature of their speeches left little doubt that their majority was the result of expediency rather than conviction.

The bishops' policy earned them unpopularity, not only among liberals but also among their former Tory protectors. Eldon, their old champion, was particularly incensed by their conduct. "I am hurt, distressed, and fatigued by what has been passing in the House of Lords," he wrote to his daughter, after the bill had passed the upper chamber. "I hope reflection may enable me, but I fear that I cannot reasonably hope it ever will, to account rationally for the conduct of the bishops."²⁶ On the other hand, the typical liberal viewpoint was indicated in one of the Lord Durham's letters, which implied a gloomy future for the Anglican Church: "The members of it, rich in worldly goods, high in temporal power, have too long abandoned the lowly habits of spiritual labor to those who, unseen by them, have been diligently sowing the seeds, the harvest of which, all the powers of Parliament cannot prevent the reaping."²⁷

A result even more dangerous than this anti-Anglican feeling was the decided stimulus for pro-Catholic agitation provided by the repeal bill. Throughout England and Ireland, Catholics who had petitioned for the Dissenters' bill now insisted upon regarding the measure as a precedent for Catholic Emancipation. Consequently, another series of pro-Catholic petitions was now brought before Parliament, each petition embodying a new protest against constitutional distinctions between Catholics and other loyal subjects.²⁸ Moreover, preparations for another Catholic relief bill were soon under way. Lord Palmerston, who had recently won his seat for Cambridge in a bitter struggle against the high Anglican faction, was now convinced that Wellington would be forced to accept any Catholic bill which Commons approved and that the bishops would take the Duke's order and "wheel about."²⁹

Such eager pro-Catholic hopes were not justified, for staunch opponents of Emancipation were now more determined than ever. They had learned a bitter lesson from repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts—a lesson which bore out too plainly Eldon's gloomy prophecies in debate concerning the Catholic question.

Their renewed determination was soon to demonstrate its strength. In June, 1828, Sir Francis Burdett's resolution calling for investigation of the Catholic question was carried against the government in the

House of Commons and was next taken up to the House of Lords, an occasion which inspired the bishops to rally for a desperate fight. Van Mildert and Law delivered the principal speeches for the Episcopal bench.³⁰ Even Copleston, who had only recently upheld Catholic Emancipation in an argument with the Duke of Cumberland,³¹ declared the time was not yet ripe for granting constitutional equality to Catholics.³² The resolution was finally defeated by a majority of forty-four, which included twenty-one bishops.³³

But if champions of Catholic Emancipation had misinterpreted the intentions of the Anglican bishops, the prelates had likewise failed to understand the power of the Catholic Association. Immediately after repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Ireland had remained comparatively quiet. Now that the issue was clear, leaders of the Association were ready to set in motion the well-oiled machinery of a vast revolutionary organization.

The first indications of a rising Irish storm came immediately in county Clare, where the Association determined to elect a Catholic, Daniel O'Connell, in place of Vesey Fitzgerald, the county's Protestant representative in the House of Commons. The fact that Fitzgerald had always been sympathetic to Catholic concessions was ignored by ardent Irish nationalists, who saw the election only as a practical test of Protestant supremacy in Ireland. Orators of the Association, accompanied by local priests, traversed every corner of the county, haranguing the impoverished electors from parish chapels. O'Connell won the election in a landslide, despite heroic efforts by the county landlords; and the British Parliament faced the problem of dealing with its newly elected Catholic member.

While Parliament considered this question during the summer and early fall of 1828, Ireland was fast approaching revolution. In some parts of the country, members of the Association were organized in infantry and cavalry units, with uniforms and martial bands.³⁴ On one typical day, they denounced the English government and the Anglican Church in two thousand meetings held all over Ireland.³⁵ In another instance, fifty thousand peasants took part in an orderly protest march, which lasted for three whole days. Fortunately, no violence occurred, but it was avoided only because the Catholic Association had again adopted a policy of watchful waiting.

The best evidence seemed to indicate that the Catholic Association might precipitate civil war which would be long and bloody, even if it could be finally won by government forces. "Such is the extraordinary power of the Association," wrote Lord Anglesey, the Irish Lord Lieutenant, "... that I am quite certain they could lead on the people to

open rebellion at a moment's notice; and their organization is such that in the hands of desperate and intelligent men, they would be extremely formidable."³⁶ Moreover, the impending revolution appeared particularly frightening because it would spring from the discontent of the miserable Irish tenants, who could not be expected to show much respect for the property rights of either the landlords or the Church.³⁷

Such threatening prospects inclined enlightened Tories toward abandoning the old high Anglican principles and granting some concessions to the Catholics. Anglesey, himself, was firmly convinced that the only hope of peace lay in drawing the teeth of the Association by allowing its leaders to sit in Parliament, an idea which was continually repeated in his dispatches.³⁸ By the summer of 1828, Peel had already admitted this opinion to himself, and Wellington was wavering. They hesitated only because certain political difficulties had to be overcome before any definite policy could be undertaken.

The Wellington ministry was almost without support from either side in the Catholic controversy. Parliament was deadlocked on the question, with a majority for concessions in the House of Commons and a majority against concessions in the House of Lords. Members of the ministry were objects of contempt and suspicion from both sides. Already, the Duke had alienated the liberal Tories in Commons by his purge of the Canningites.³⁹ Moreover, the "old guard Tories" in the House of Lords were still remembering repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Their supporters subjected the government to increasing anti-Catholic pressure during the summer, pouring their petitions into Parliament from numerous "Brunswick Clubs," scattered over England and Ireland.⁴⁰

Anglican clergymen took a leading part in the agitation which was tying the hands of the Tory government. For decades, the typical country parsons had been taught to respect a Tory party which consistently used "No-popery" as its rallying cry. Now, instead of quietly supporting Wellington, they were the leading spirits of the "Brunswick Clubs." They howled down an open air discussion of the Catholic question at Newton Abbot in Devonshire; they helped to organize a gigantic "No-popery" meeting at Pennenden Heath in Kent; and in various other places they attempted to rouse popular discontent against the yielding policy of the government.⁴¹

Nor was this Anglican pressure confined to the lesser clergy. During the fall of 1828, the Duke received numerous prodding letters from Dr. Henry Phillpotts, Dean of Chester. Phillpotts urged that the Catholic clergy of Ireland be deported for claiming ecclesiastical titles and cautioned the Duke against making concessions to the Catholics until the Catholic Association was completely crushed.⁴² In vain, the har-

ried Prime Minister attempted to explain that no law authorized suppression of the Association and that Parliament could not be expected to pass such a law.⁴³ The Dean remained unconvinced. He insisted that the government's officers in Ireland, including the Lord Lieutenant, had failed to enforce existing laws against the clearly seditious activities of the Association.⁴⁴ Such fervent arguments forced Wellington to investigate the policies of the government's officials in Ireland.⁴⁵ Before October was over, Phillpotts, and others of his opinion were somewhat placated when the Duke replaced Anglesey with an anti-Catholic Lord Lieutenant.

The Prime Minister at the same time was seeking a compromise settlement of the Irish problem. All during the autumn he begged the King to sanction some plan of concession to the Catholics. These efforts gained him nothing, and at last, in the hope of bringing powerful pressure to bear, Wellington sought aid from bishops, as Peel had done the year before.

The prelates were far from unanimous concerning the policy which should be followed. Conservative bishops like Law and Van Mildert, who represented the majority opinion, believed that further yielding would destroy the Establishment and were therefore resolutely determined against any change. Some prelates, however, including the Sumner brothers, who were Bishops of Chester and Winchester,⁴⁶ favored concessions. At the opening of December, 1828, Phillpotts gloomily predicted that the Archbishop of York, as well as the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Rochester, and Lichfield, would support the Duke's proposals.⁴⁷ But although some of the bishops believed that moderate concessions might be wise, they were fearful of the reaction among their own clergy, who had been taught "No-popery" for so long.⁴⁸

Another cause for hesitation among the prelates was the idea, which Wellington had long been considering, of coming to an agreement with the Catholic Church. Strangely enough, this betrayal of pure Anglican doctrine received its most enthusiastic support from a leading high Anglican, Dean Phillpotts, who gradually came to show more concern for Anglican property and tithes than for Anglican theology. In writing to the Duke, Phillpotts suggested that the Catholic bishops relinquish their church property and be given an annual income by Parliament. If an understanding could be reached on this point, he believed it could be followed by a Catholic Emancipation bill framed to disfranchise the forty shilling freeholders and "insure that those who may be returned shall be of that station . . . which would render them less dangerous to our institutions."⁴⁹ The plan, in general outline, was submitted to Wellington on September 12, 1828. It provided that a

political agent be sent to Rome, that the Roman Catholic clergy be paid by the state, that the Irish vote be restricted by a property qualification, and that prospective Catholic members of Parliament be required to swear their loyalty to the government.⁵⁰ But Phillpotts' suggestions were received unfavorably by the bishops when Wellington approached them. Even the liberal Bishop of Winchester considered the plan dangerous because it would sanction "by public support, the teachers of unsound tenets."⁵¹

Despite such differences of clerical opinion, Wellington went ahead with his efforts to convert the bishops and the higher clergy. During the early part of December, he dispatched letters to various prelates begging them to consider the seriousness of the Irish problem. The Bishop of Oxford was called upon, toward the end of the month, to settle a particularly embarrassing problem. Peel, who held his seat for the University of Oxford, had earlier determined to resign. He had been prevailed upon by the King not to go; but his continued presence in the Cabinet meant that some measure of Catholic Emancipation had to be carried; and the Bishop was commissioned to popularize Peel's future policy among his rabidly anti-Catholic clerical constituents at the University.⁵²

Meanwhile, the Duke arranged a meeting of the leading prelates at Lambeth on December 26. Only three attended, and they could arrive at no definite decision. Van Mildert, as usual, argued forcefully against the Catholics; Blomfield could not see how the proposed measure would satisfy the Irish; and Howley, the new Archbishop of Canterbury, said very little. The Duke offered no argument in reply, except to assure them of civil war unless something were done.⁵³ A day or two later at another meeting, all three prelates informed the Duke that they could not sanction his policy and would offer their determined opposition to Catholic Emancipation in any form.⁵⁴ Further proof of the general clerical attitude came in a letter to Peel, written on January 1, 1829. "They are all decidedly hostile to all concessions," confided Bishop Lloyd, "and will not consent to them in any form. I consider the matter therefore as settled."⁵⁵

The bishops who defied Wellington at Lambeth were determined to preserve their high Anglican principles, but their decision only increased their danger. It brought to an end the secure alliance with the government, which had sheltered the Church since the days of James II, and left them at the mercy of their enemies, both in and out of Parliament. In addition, it made inevitable a definite split among the clergy, until, as the spring of 1829 progressed, bishops argued with bishops, and parsons fought beneath the sacred towers of Oxford.

Perhaps all of this could have been forgotten if the bishops' strategy had achieved its purpose; but instead of frightening the Duke away from the Catholic question, it only crystallized his determination.

By the opening of January, the government had taken decisive action. Peel could see that the bishops, instead of reconciling the King to the policy of his ministers, might now goad the monarch into a formal declaration against the Catholics.⁵⁶ Consequently, he and Wellington increased their pressure upon the King; when they promised their resignations unless he would agree, George IV consented to countenance a consideration of the Catholic claims. At the opening of Parliament in 1829, Wellington announced in the House of Lords that the government proposed to remove all Catholic disabilities, except those resting on special grounds; and Peel made a similar declaration in the lower House.

Having defied the bishops, the government continued its attempts at reconciliation. The mediator, Dr. Phillpotts, convinced now that some measure of Catholic relief was inevitable, wrote again to Wellington to explain a new plan for settling the Catholic issue. His proposal called for a loyalty oath which all Catholics entering Parliament would be required to take.⁵⁷ When the Prime Minister indicated that the government would not oppose such an amendment, the Dean became an open advocate of compromise.⁵⁸

On February 4, Phillpotts laid his scheme before the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Howley, and the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Van Mildert. It embodied five main points: (1) crushing the Roman Catholic Association, (2) disfranchising the Irish forty-shilling freeholders, (3) prohibiting the assertion of ecclesiastical jurisdiction by the Roman Catholic clergy, (4) government licensing of Roman Catholic priests, and (5) adopting a declaration, to be signed by all members of Parliament, binding the signer to maintain the Protestant religion and the Anglican Church.⁵⁹ Even these securities, however, did not satisfy Howley or Van Mildert; and the Archbishop soon confessed privately to Lord Colchester that the whole idea was utterly objectionable.⁶⁰

After the failure of Dean Phillpotts' strategy ended all hope of recruiting the prelates in a body, Wellington turned attention to individuals with the idea of salvaging as many votes as possible. When the long-awaited Catholic Bill was introduced in Commons on March 5, the Duke could expect nine votes from the Episcopal bench. One of these belonged to Dr. Bathurst, of Norwich, who had voted consistently in favor of Emancipation since 1812; Dr. Murray and Dr. Copleston, recently appointed as Bishops of Rochester and Llandaff, were now in line; Dr. Lloyd, one of Peel's few clerical friends at Oxford, had been

persuaded; and the evangelical bishops, including Dr. Ryder, the Bishop of Lichfield, as well as the two Sumner brothers, had been converted by the personal efforts of the Duke.⁶¹ In addition to these supposedly sure supporters, the Bishop of St. David's, the Archbishop of York, and the Bishop of London professed to be in doubt and presumably might still be persuaded.⁶²

The majority of the bishops, however, were still on the other side of the fence. They were led by Dr. Howley, and they included such pillars of the Church as Dr. Van Mildert and Bishop Law of Bath and Wells. Perhaps the most determined one among them was Dr. Burgess, the Bishop of Salisbury, who wrote repeated letters to Wellington, attempting to prove by lengthy arguments that the proposed bill was contrary to religion, contrary to the oaths of members of Parliament, and contrary to the King's coronation oath.⁶³

The divided Anglican opinion was demonstrated conclusively at the Oxford election of 1829. Peel, after deciding to support Catholic Emancipation, had resigned his seat for the University and then sought re-election. His electoral campaign precipitated a bitter struggle. On Sir Robert's side were a number of influential churchmen, including Dr. Lloyd, Dr. Phillpotts, and the liberal Dr. Whately. Opposed to Peel in support of Sir Robert Inglis were the enthusiastic high churchmen, under the leadership of John Keble, John Henry Newman, and Bishop Van Mildert. As a result of their efforts, hundreds of country clergymen from all over England were drawn toward Oxford, in the hope of saving the Church from Peel and his party.⁶⁴ Fanatical parsons, with red-hot irons, branded "NO PEEL" on the doors of Sir Robert's own college;⁶⁵ others drew caricatures of Phillpotts in red chalk on chapel walls and labeled the Dean as a "great rat."⁶⁶ The final count found Peel rejected by a majority of a hundred and forty-six votes. This result seemed to bear out Newman's contention that Wellington could not make a tool of the Church; but Anglican prestige had suffered greatly. "The Oxford parsons have behaved so abominably at the election that they laid themselves open for the severest strictures," observed Charles Greville, after the triumph had been won.⁶⁷

As rumors circulated concerning the sinister forces which were conspiring to deliver England over to the Catholics, clerical agitation throughout the country approached the heights it had reached at Oxford. Anglican indignation ran rampant in tracts and pamphlets; preachers delivered sermons against the Catholics from hundreds of Tory pulpits; and clergymen organized protest meetings. Parsons went among their country parishioners displaying inflammatory placards

which showed furious priests, with cross in one hand and torch in the other.⁶⁸ At the height of their crusade, a criminal named Burke, who had been convicted of murder, confessed to the Catholic faith, a fact which was eagerly seized upon by over-zealous Anglicans to show the black character of all Catholics.⁶⁹ Anglican clergymen in the South-western counties paraded before the simple farmers, bearing signs upon which the word "murder" was printed in large black letters. If Emancipation were granted, they told their frightened listeners, the Catholics would again rule England, everyone would be forced to part with hymnbooks and Bibles, no religious service except the mass would be permitted, and anyone who dared protest would be hanged by some agent from Rome.⁷⁰

The language used on such occasions was often extremely provocative. "Will you submit to a Popish King?" demanded a clergyman orator at Sheffield, early in March. "Look at that Church in which you received the rites of baptism . . . and tell me if you will see it turned into a temple of idolatry. Will you consent to have your daughters taken from you . . . in order that they may become victims to the lusts of monks?"⁷¹ Some people were even threatened with eternal hellfire if they did not protect the holy Church. A Pembroke county clergyman called upon his parishioners "as they would answer . . . before the awful tribunal of Almighty God, to come forward in defense of their Holy religion; and he told them if they did not, they would identify themselves with Papists, Deists, and infidels, and would stand an equal chance of damnation."⁷²

The results of this fanatical clerical agitation were soon apparent in the flood of petitions, many of which were presented by the bishops in the House of Lords. Bishop Law, upon submitting several petitions from Somerset, asserted that similar expressions could be raised from every parish in his diocese.⁷³ The Bishop of Llandaff also felt himself bound to announce his clergy's dislike for the bill. Bishop Van Mildert took every occasion to call their lordships' attention to the opinions of loyal Englishmen, resolutely opposed to that "spirit of intolerant domination, characteristic of the Church of Rome."⁷⁴ The Archbishop of York, still not sure which way he would vote, expressed agreement with the opposition of his clergy and deanery at Craven.⁷⁵ In like manner, the Bishop of Rochester presented an anti-Catholic petition, although he did observe that his belief in Protestant supremacy did not require his concurrence in oppression of Catholics.⁷⁶

On the other hand, despite the increased fanaticism of most clergymen, a determined Anglican minority supported the Relief Bill. One of these was Dr. Thomas Arnold, who was later to accomplish such re-

markable success at Rugby. "I have been feeding the press, sheet by sheet, with a pamphlet or book on the Roman Catholic question," he wrote to a friend in March, 1829. "You will say there was no need; but I wanted to show that to do national injustice is a sin. . . ."⁷⁷ One Evangelical clergyman, the Reverend Charles Simeon, preached a famous sermon in which he warmly praised the efforts of the Wellington government as the only means of avoiding civil war in Ireland.⁷⁸ Dr. Bathurst, the aging Bishop of Norwich, raised a petition in favor of the bill from among the clergy of his diocese.⁷⁹ Another suggestive petition, presented by Lord Lansdowne from the clergy of Wilts, affirmed their complete satisfaction with the proposed bill.⁸⁰ Moreover, a number of clergymen in Cornwall sent indignant protests to Parliament upon hearing that a Tory lord had declared the Cornish clergy to be one hundred per cent against concessions.⁸¹

Meanwhile, in the face of clerical and Tory opposition, the new Catholic Relief Bill was making steady progress. Peel introduced the measure in Commons on March 5, 1829. The Bill provided for the admission of Catholics to Parliament, to all judicial offices except the ecclesiastical courts, and to all civil offices except the regency, the Chancellorship of England, and the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. It included a new oath for the protection of the Anglican Church, along with certain guarantees against Catholic dispensations of Church patronage.⁸² Although strongly opposed, the Bill was pushed through Commons in less than a month and introduced in the House of Lords by Wellington, who justified his action in a powerful speech which vividly depicted the dangers of civil war in Ireland.

The bishops had already made up their minds, but they had yet to carry through the formality of debate. With due solemnity, those prelates supporting the government rose to apologize for their actions. The bishop of Oxford admitted that he would rather maintain the existing situation but pointed out the possibility of bloody revolution, which would leave the Church in an even more precarious position than before.⁸³ Bishop Copleston was also convinced that the time was at last ripe for Catholic Emancipation. He denied that Emancipation was a theological question; the Catholics were being favored for purely political reasons, not because of the excellence or truth of their religious ideas.⁸⁴ The same general opinions were voiced by Dr. Jenkinson, the Bishop of St. David's, and by Dr. Ryder, the Bishop of Lichfield.⁸⁵

On the other side of the issue were arrayed the old Anglican stalwarts. Their champion, the Archbishop of Canterbury, delivered an exceptionally long speech, in which he reviewed in detail the whole history of the Catholic disability laws. Like Dr. Lloyd, he readily ad-

mitted the possibilities of a bloody Irish revolution, but come what might, he could never consent to subvert the Constitution and the Anglican Church.⁸⁶ Bishop Blomfield followed this by declaring that the proposed bill was the opening step which would eventually lead to Catholic control of the country.⁸⁷ The next day, the Archbishop of York cast off his doubts and expressed his definite opposition.⁸⁸ Immediately after his conversion, Dr. Van Mildert delivered the most violent speech from the rebellious side of the Episcopal bench. He was filled with uneasy prophecies: the bill would cause great danger; the Irish would not be satisfied; the Catholics would take over Parliament. And then he turned scornfully to the conduct of those bishops who had betrayed the Church. They had allowed the pressure of ministers to deflect them from their sworn responsibilities and were now crying expediency to gloss over their own weaknesses. A true Anglican bishop, he told the House proudly, could recognize no political expediency which threatened the Church.⁸⁹ Other speeches in opposition to the bill were delivered by Dr. Law, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, by Dr. Burgess, the Bishop of Salisbury, and by the Irish Archbishop of Armagh. In addition to these efforts, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London strongly supported an amendment suggested by Lord Kenyon, which would have banned Catholics from a number of high offices.⁹⁰

Despite these most persistent efforts, the bill was brought to a final division and passed by a large majority.⁹¹ The bishops voted seventeen to ten against the government, a departure from their usual policy which had no precedent in the memory of any member of the House. Of the prelates who had stood by Wellington in repealing the Test and Corporation Acts, only four—the Bishops of Chester, Llandaff, Lichfield, and St. David's—remained. The Bishops of Oxford, Norwich, and Rochester, who had failed to vote on the earlier measure, also supported the bill; and the government picked up three other votes from Dr. Charles Sumner, the new Bishop of Winchester, and from the Irish prelates of Derry and Kildare. Of the eight bishops opposing the government on repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, seven, comprising the Bishops of Durham, Bath and Wells, Bristol, Salisbury, St. Asaph, Ely, and Peterborough, voted with the minority on the Catholic Relief Bill.⁹² But five other prelates, the Bishops of London, Lincoln, Gloucester, Hertford, and Chichester, all of whom had followed Peel in 1828, were now lined up on the other side. The remaining anti-Catholic votes came from the English Bishops of Carlisle and Worcester and the Irish Bishops of Bangor and Meath.⁹³

Even a superficial examination of the vote reveals how far the old Church and state system had disintegrated by the spring of 1829.

In the past, the Lords Spiritual had usually voted cheerfully as a body, according to the direction of the ministers. Now the determined advocates of pure Anglicanism in the House of Lords—the bishops behind Van Mildert—were in open opposition. Moreover, those prelates, represented by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had been inclined to favor moderate concessions, had been so frightened that they were now the breathing symbols of reaction.⁹⁴ Catholic Emancipation was nearly a mortal blow to Anglican supremacy: it divided and confused the clergy; it bred distrust of government among the majority of Churchmen; and it set in motion a frightened reaction within the Church, at a time when both Parliament and the country were becoming increasingly liberal.

This was all accompanied by a weakening of Toryism and a growing dissolution of the bonds between the Church and the Tory Party. Lord Eldon and the Duke of Cumberland, with many country squires and parsons, were now vehement against the Wellington government. Nor were these ultra-Tories likely to forget their betrayal by some of the bishops. During the Catholic debates, Eldon had clashed repeatedly with the Bishop of Oxford;⁹⁵ and *Blackwood's Magazine* marked the passage of Catholic Emancipation with a satire on the conduct of the prelates entitled "Some Account of the Conduct of Bishop Brown."⁹⁶ By 1829, the Tories were hopelessly divided into ministerialists, Canningites, and Eldonians; but the clergy as a whole could look to none of these factions for support.

Catholic Emancipation also contributed indirectly to the liberal campaign against the Church. Liberal peers seized every opportunity to prove the persecuting policy of churchmen. Indeed, their careful investigations exposed the furious agitation of the country parsons and the fraudulent character of many clerical petitions.⁹⁷ The situation was ably summed up in a letter written by Dr. Arnold to a clergyman friend in March, 1829: "The worse part, I think, of the whole business, is the effectual manner in which the clergy generally, and those of Oxford especially, have cut their throats in the judgment of all enlightened public men. . . ."⁹⁸

Catholic Emancipation destroyed that formidable Tory fortress which had protected the Church for so long; and it supplied new vigor for the liberal movement. Moreover, it failed to remove Irish opposition to the Established Church. Unfortunately, Dean Phillpotts' disfranchisement scheme was realized in the provisions of the Emancipation Act.⁹⁹ Thus "the Roman Catholic priests" were deprived "of most of their power,"¹⁰⁰ and the vast body of Irish tenants, the very class which had revolted from the domination of their English landlords to supply

the driving force of the Catholic Association, were denied any future voice in their own government. The Irish Catholics were not placated; they were only betrayed; and their resentment was to plague English statesmen during the rest of the nineteenth century.

1. In addition to the Catholic Emancipation Act, mentioned above, Parliament, in 1828, repealed the Test and Corporation Acts. These latter laws, which dated from the reign of Charles II, had excluded anyone from public office who refused to receive the sacrament according to the rites of the Anglican Church.
2. Countess of Airlie, *Lady Palmerston and Her Times* (London, 1922), 123-36.
3. These names and titles are likely to be confusing because the bishops were often shifted about in their assignments. The situation was particularly fluid after the death of Manners-Sutton in July, 1828, when three important incumbents changed places. Wherever such changes occurred, they are indicated in footnotes.
4. Charles Abbot, Lord Colchester, *The Diary of Lord Colchester* (London, 1861), III, 486-89; Alfred Blomfield, *A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield* (London, 1868), I, 149; Duke of Buckingham, *Memoirs of the Court of George IV* (London, 1859), II, 324.
5. *Colchester Diary*, III, 496-97.
6. C. S. Parker, *The Life of Robert Peel* (London, 1900), I, 250-52.
7. W. E. H. Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland* (New York, 1903), II, 83; James A. Reynolds, *The Catholic Emancipation Crisis in Ireland, 1823-1829*, (London, 1954), 27-29.
8. *Colchester Diary*, III, 503-04.
9. George Edward Biber, *Bishop Blomfield and His Times* (London, 1857), 19-20.
10. Sir Robert Peel, *Memoirs of the Right Honorable Sir Robert Peel* (London, 1856), I, 65-66.
11. Great Britain, *The Parliamentary Debates* (London, 1812 ff.), Commons, XVIII, 676, 816, and 1137.
12. Peel to the Bishop of Oxford, March 1, 1828. Peel, *Memoirs*, I, 70-71.
13. *Ibid.*, 74; W. J. Copleston, *Memoirs of Edward Copleston, Bishop of Llandaff* (London, 1851), 123.
14. Peel, *Memoirs*, I, 74-77.
15. *Ibid.*, 86.
16. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XVIII, 923-25.
17. *Ibid.*, 1485-91 and 1508-17.
18. *Ibid.*, 1491-97.
19. *Ibid.*, 1588-90.
20. *Ibid.*, 1591-1607.
21. *Ibid.*, XIX, 110-15 and 166.
22. *Ibid.*, 116-131.
23. *Ibid.*, XVIII, 1585-86 and 1591.
24. *Ibid.*, XIX, 163-67.
25. *Ibid.*, 236-37. The Archbishop of Canterbury's vote in favor of the bill was cast by Bishop Blomfield; Dr. Manners-Sutton was so ill that he could not attend the session. The Archbishop died shortly after, on July 21, 1828, and was succeeded by Dr. Howley. Howley was succeeded as Bishop of London by Dr. Blomfield.
26. Lord John Campbell, *The Lives of the Lord Chancellors* (New York, 1925), IX, 265-66.
27. Stuart J. Reid, *The Life and Letters of the First Earl of Durham* (London, 1906), I, 193.
28. See especially the Catholic petitions presented by Bishop Bathurst on May 5, 1828. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XIX, 344-45.
29. Evelyn Ashley, *The Life and Correspondence of Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston* (London, 1897), I, 141 and 191.
30. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XIX, 1150-59 and 1174-82.
31. *Copleston Memoirs*, 128.
32. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XIX, 1198-99. Bishop Copleston's position is more understandable when one considers the negotiations which preceded his appointment. In 1827 he had assured the King and the Prime Minister that even though he was sympathetic to the idea of Catholic Emancipation, he was not in favor of legislative action at that time. The King interpreted this to mean that Copleston was safe for all practical purposes. See Arthur Aspinall (ed.), *The Letters of King George IV, 1812-1820* (London, 1938), III, 333-36.
33. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XIX, 1294-95. The only bishops who voted for the resolution were Dr. Bathurst of Norwich and Dr. Murray of Rochester.
34. *Annual Register* (1828), 137.
35. Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, II, 85-86. Cf. Henry Jephson, *The Platform, Its Rise and Progress* (New York, 1892), II, 15-20; and Reynolds, *Catholic Emancipation Crisis in Ireland*, 151-9.

36. Peel, *Memoirs*, I, 147-48.
37. Immediately after the election, Fitzgerald wrote to Peel: "I have polled all the gentry and the fifty pound freeholders—the gentry to a man . . . All the great interests have broken down, and the desertion has been universal . . ." *Ibid.*, 113.
38. *Ibid.*, 148.
39. This purge had followed a proposal, introduced by Lord John Russell in June, 1828, which would have transferred the two members from the rotten borough of Penryn to Manchester. The measure was supported by Huskisson and the liberal Tories. When Huskisson offered his resignation because he had opposed the government, the Prime Minister quickly accepted. Wellington thus eliminated from his cabinet the very people who could have helped him carry Catholic Emancipation. — See George M. Trevelyan, *Lord Grey of the Reform Bill* (London, 1920), 209; J. R. M. Butler, *The Passing of the Great Reform Bill* (London, 1914), 48.
40. The movement gained momentum in June when a number of influential Tories convened at Lord Kenyon's home to consider the best means of channeling popular opposition to the Catholics.—*Colchester Diary*, III, 574-75.
41. Keith G. Feiling, *The Second Tory Party* (London, 1938), 369; *Annual Register* (1828), 147; Jephson, *Platform*, II, 22.
42. *Dispatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda of Field Marshal Arthur, Duke of Wellington* (London, 1880), IV, 664-65 and V, 130.
43. *Ibid.*, 145-46.
44. *Ibid.*, 155-59.
45. *Ibid.*, 173-75.
46. Dr. John Bird Sumner succeeded Blomfield as Bishop of Chester in September, 1828.
47. George Sumner, *The Life of Charles Richard Sumner, Bishop of Winchester* (London, 1876), 157-58.
48. *Ibid.*, 158.
49. Wellington, *Dispatches*, IV, 324-28.
50. *Ibid.*, V, 49-50.
51. Sumner, *Life of Sumner*, 159.
52. Henry Reeve (ed.), *The Greville Memoirs* (New York, 1875), I, 124.
53. Blomfield, *Memoir of Bishop Blomfield*, I, 149.
54. Peel, *Memoirs*, I, 276-77.
55. *Ibid.*, 278.
56. *Ibid.*, 278.
57. Wellington, *Dispatches*, V, 477.
58. Cf. *Colchester, Diary*, III, 594-5; and Reeve, *Greville Memoirs*, I, 139.
59. Wellington, *Dispatches*, V, 486; *Colchester Diary*, III, 595-6.
60. *Ibid.*, 601.
61. Sumner, *Life of Sumner*, 160-61; Reeve, *Greville Memoirs*, I, 167.
62. See Dr. Blomfield's speech of February 10, when he presented a petition from Phillpotts and the clergy of Chester, *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XX, 170.
63. Wellington, *Dispatches*, V, 509-11 and 528-30.
64. So enthusiastically did they respond that a writer in *Blackwood's* could boast later that they thronged every road along the way.—XXVI, 237.
65. Feiling, *Second Tory Party*, 371.
66. Frederick Arnold, *Our Bishops and Deans* (London, 1875), I, 194.
67. Reeve, *Greville Memoirs*, I, 156.
68. J. A. Roebuck, *A History of the Whig Ministry of 1830* (London, 1852), I, 114-15. Cf. John A. Langford, *A Century of Birmingham Life* (London, 1868), II, 479.
69. William L. Mathieson, *England in Transition, 1789-1832* (London, 1920), 247.
70. Exposed by Lord King, March 2, 1829, *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XX, 644.
71. Exposed by Lord Wharncliffe, *ibid.*, 715-18.
72. *Ibid.*, 1530.
73. *Ibid.*, 134.
74. *Ibid.*, 244-45.
75. *Ibid.*, 671.
76. *Ibid.*, 725 and 1364.
77. A. P. Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold* (Boston, 1860), I, 225.
78. William Carew, *Memoirs of the Life of the Reverend Charles Simeon* (New York, 1847), 370-72.
79. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XX, 928-29.
80. *Ibid.*, 538.
81. *Ibid.*, 635-7.
82. T. E. May, *The Constitutional History of England* (New York, 1889), II, 376-77.
83. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XXI, 78-9; *Annual Register* (1829), 69-71.
84. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XXI, 487-98.
85. *Ibid.*, 41 and 668-70.
86. *Ibid.*, 58-75; *Annual Register* (1829), 69-71.
87. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XXI, 119-23.
88. *Ibid.*, 143-6.
89. This speech was obviously aimed at the Bishop of Oxford, who later replied to it, *ibid.*, 146-55.
90. *Ibid.*, 552-55. The amendment would have excluded Catholics from the offices of Lord Treasurer, Lord Privy Seal, First Lord of the Admiralty, Master General of Ordnance, Foreign Secretary, Home Secretary, and Colonial Secretary.

91. The Act as passed abolished the requirement that prospective office holders deny certain Catholic beliefs such as transubstantiation and the invocation of saints. The old oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, passed by Parliament under various sovereigns, from Henry VIII to William III, were eliminated. In their place, a new oath was substituted which bound members of Parliament and other office holders to serve the monarch, renounce the temporal power of the Pope in Britain, and accept the Anglican Establishment as the state church. However, priests were still excluded from Parliament, and Catholics were denied the right to serve as monarch or to hold the offices of Lord Chancellor of England, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.
92. It is interesting to note that neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor the Archbishop of York voted.
93. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XXI, 694-6.
94. The Bishop of Winchester, who voted for the Catholic Relief Bill, was soon to repent and rejoin their ranks.
95. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XXI, 505-506.
96. XXVII, 702 ff; cf. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XXV, 728-32.
97. On March 5, Lord Durham showed that a petition, presented by Van Mildert, had been signed by two hundred teen age boys, *ibid.*, XX, 720-21.
98. Stanley, *Arnold*, I, 226.
99. *Parliamentary Debates*, Lords, XX, 1329ff., and XXI, 407-41.
100. *Colchester Diary*, III, 605.

1960 Brewer Prize Contest

The American Society of Church History announces that its next Brewer Prize competition for a book-length manuscript in church history will conclude in 1960. The award will be announced at the annual meeting of the Society in December of this year. It will consist of a subsidy of one thousand dollars to assist the author in the publication of the winning manuscript, which shall be described on its title-page as the "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History" and shall be published in a manner acceptable to the Society. If competing essays are otherwise of equal quality, preference will be given to those dealing with topics related to the history of Congregationalism. Complete manuscripts in final form, fully annotated, must be in the hands of the Secretary, Professor Winthrop S. Hudson, 1100 South Goodman St., Rochester 20, New York, by September 15, 1960. There must be two copies, a typescript and a first carbon, on standard weight paper, double-spaced, with a left-hand margin of at least an inch and one-half.

THE ROLE OF THE SOUTH IN THE PRESBYTERIAN SCHISM OF 1837-38

ELWYN A. SMITH, *Pittsburgh Theological Seminary*

In 1927 William Warren Sweet observed that "the most important and far-reaching of the schisms in the American churches were caused by Negro slavery and the effects of the bitter contests in the churches over slavery, which began nearly a century ago, are still with us. Therefore any study of the peculiar factors which have determined the course of American church history must of necessity give a prominent place to slavery."¹ He himself pursued this suggestion in subsequent research.²

A number of the church divisions before the Civil War were plainly caused by dispute over slavery; but the Presbyterian situation was different. Presbyterians divided into separate General Assemblies as early as 1838. The records of the Old School Assembly reveal a scrupulous concern to exclude all debate on the slavery issue from national deliberation and the body remained undivided until 1861 when the issue of federal union was injected into the General Assembly. Only with the outbreak of the Civil War was there formed a southern Presbyterianism.

The New School debated slavery more freely but experienced similar problems. Discussion was sporadically repressed for fear of losing the small southern contingent, but in 1857 the issue divided that Assembly. By this time, the southern New School men had outstripped Old School Presbyterianism in frantic support of slavery and the right of the South to its own social institutions.³ In 1864 the regional issue submerged the issues of the earlier division. The present Presbyterian Church in the United States is the product of the two earlier southern Presbyterianisms and other smaller segments added by 1870.

These circumstances have insistently raised the question of the role of slavery controversy in the division of 1837-38. If it had not been a factor, as contended by Old School apologists, why was the issue so conspicuously absent among Old School Presbyterians during the heated decades preceding the outbreak of War? The southern wing of the other Protestant groups emerged very distinctly during this period. Could it be true that Presbyterianism remained untouched by the pervasive sectionalism of the period?

Ever since 1837, Old School apologists had vigorously repelled the suggestion that the division of that date had any other causes than pure love of the gospel and concern for church control of church affairs. Immediately after the schism, for example, the Synod of North Caro-

lina explicitly repudiated the suggestion that the abolition issue had figured in southern thinking.⁴ The view that "it had little or no influence in bringing about the decision" and that "the [doctrinal] question was honestly debated and decided on its own merits" was pursued at length by Old School writers such as Samuel J. Baird.⁵ A further reason for the obscuring of sectional interests as a factor in the division is the disappearance of slavery controversy after emancipation. Presbyterians continued to debate doctrinal and disciplinary problems and to invoke the past in support of their points. But with slavery gone, references to the schism of 1837-38 seldom mention it.

The causes of that division have been abundantly discussed but for the most part by partisans, largely Old School. Few deny that there existed an irritating, perhaps even significant, theological dispute in Presbyterianism from the time of its public excitement in the Philadelphia area in 1816, and that this argument, exacerbated by political stresses within the church, was a major cause of the break. But the question of the relative importance of these other causes and the highly significant part played by the South remains unsettled. C. Bruce Staiger, in the best general treatment of the bearing of abolition-slavery controversy on the schism, concludes that "if it had not been for the developments concerning slavery in the Assemblies of 1835 and 1836, the break would never have occurred. . . ."⁶ This would mean simply that the Presbyterian schism was the first of a series of Protestant divisions over slavery; and that the doctrinal, disciplinary and political disputes that had set Philadelphia against New England and Ohio and excited a highly-charged partisanship around practical questions such as the education of the ministry and the conduct of missions were of themselves insufficient to divide Presbyterianism. It is never possible to debate definitively what would have happened; but a careful appraisal of the role of the South in the period leading up to the division scarcely warrants the conclusion that the slavery issue alone tipped the balance toward schism. It is the purpose of this paper to throw further light on the development of southern Presbyterian opinion before the schism and to offer a somewhat more precise judgment on the role of the South in forming the two Presbyterianisms which emerged after 1838.

On June 5, 1835, the *Southern Religious Telegraph* of Richmond, Virginia, reported: "On Tuesday last week, Rev. J. H. Dickey presented a memorial to the Assembly to adopt measures to discountenance and remove the evils of slavery." Dickey was from the Chillicothe district in Ohio, a center of abolitionist agitation. His petition was one of many and to prepare a response a committee was appointed to report to the General Assembly of 1836.

The whole South had been aroused by the impiety of the New

England abolitionists and the highly colored pamphlet literature published by the Anti-Slavery Society in New York. Furthermore, abolitionists had been active at the Assembly of 1835. Theodore Weld, modest but passionate in his cause, had come to Pittsburgh about June 1st, specifically "to get up one or two abolition meetings and secure to our cause the open advocacy of some men of standing in the church."⁷ He was successful in enlisting prominent New School figures like Beman along with Old School men from Chillicothe, Ohio. "I find that forty-eight commissioners in the Assembly are decidedly with us in sentiment on the subject of slavery—believing slavery a sin and immediate emancipation a duty. Twenty-seven of this number are ministers and of these six are ministers in slave states." Progress during the year preceding had been as great among Presbyterians as in the general populace. "Last year," wrote Weld to a colleague, "it is not known that there were more than two decided immediate abolitionists in the Assembly. This year immediate abolitionists constitute nearly one fourth part of the Assembly. Our principles are perforating the torpid conscience of the church with prodigious power and within the last year have modified the public sentiment on the subject of slavery and produced greater changes than have ever been known in the same time on any other subject." Samuel Galloway, another agent of the Anti-Slavery Society, did not seriously overstate the case, so far as Ohio was concerned, when he wrote a month later: "... you will hear it said . . . 'it looks as if the Presbyterian Church were becoming an Abolition Society.' The signs are truly propitious and after a few more convulsions, by the help of God, the victory is ours. . . ."⁸

Between the Assemblies of 1835 and 1836, for the first time since 1818, a full inquiry was to be made into slavery in a church known to be generally tolerant of it. The reaction was sharp throughout most of the South. The bounds of Hopewell Presbytery included Atlanta and a large section of Georgia and the influence of its declarations was important in the newer western areas of the South. "Anticipating the discussion of various vitally important matters at the approaching session of the General Assembly, the Presbytery of Hopewell takes this opportunity to instruct its delegates. . . . From the movements of certain ecclesiastical bodies in our church . . . and from the known views of some members of the Committee . . . we are induced to apprehend that abolition will be introduced through the report . . ." of the Miller Committee. Summarizing the southern argument against proscribing slavery⁹ the Hopewell record continues: "The political institution of domestic slavery, as it exists in the South, is not a lawful or constitutional subject of discussion, much less of action by the General Assembly. . . . So soon as the General Assembly passes any ecclesiastical laws or recommends any action which shall interfere with this in-

stitution, this Presbytery will regard such laws and acts as tyrannical and odious—and from that moment will regard itself independent of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. . . . Our delegates to the approaching Assembly are hereby enjoined to use all Christian means to prevent the discussion of domestic slavery in the Assembly—to protest in our name against all acts that involve or approve abolition—and to withdraw from the Assembly and return home if in spite of their efforts, acts of this character shall be passed.”¹⁰

Even to the wording, the Hopewell action was typical of about a dozen presbyteries in the South. In their preoccupation with the slavery problems, Southern Presbyterians were scarcely aware of the issues that vexed their Northern brethren. For the spate of anti-slavery tracts that had flooded the South, blame inevitably attached to abolitionists in the churches as well as to New England radicals. Benjamin Gildersleeve, editor of the *Charleston Observer*, anticipated the course of events to come. “The Presbyteries in this Synod have all, without concert, taken a position . . . precisely alike,” he wrote on April 23rd. “If there is to be a report upon it from the Committee appointed last year, let it come and let it be settled at once and let no other business take the precedence over it. The agitators will probably seek . . . to keep it back—reserve it to the last and then hurry it through in the absence of some of the members and in the weariness of all. But if it has to be met, we wish it met with a full house . . . that the southern churches may know the precise relation which they hold to the General Assembly and know it before other subjects of more absorbing interest at the North and West than here shall have been introduced. . . .”

The Assembly committee was astutely and justly composed but it was an enigma to the South: Dr. Samuel Miller of Princeton Seminary; Dr. N. S. S. Beman of Troy, N. Y., a New School leader in an area known for its New England bent; Dr. James Hoge of Columbus, Ohio, whose father was the first professor in the South's only “seminary”; James H. Dickey, the voice of Chillicothe, where abolitionism crossed the “school” line; and John Witherspoon of Harmony Presbytery in South Carolina, a leading anti-abolitionist and an opinion-maker in the South.¹¹

Whatever its report, the South had little confidence that the committee could bring serious attention to bear upon the issue that concerned it most. Wrote Gildersleeve: “It is probable that both parties will make an effort to secure the cooperation of our southern delegates on other questions than those in which we are most deeply interested by holding out such expectations as will not be fully realized in the event of giving those other questions the priority. It is vitally important

to the peace and quiet of our Southern Churches and to their confidence in the General Assembly that this agitated subject should be definitely closed. . . ."¹²

The South could not feel that anything critical was at stake between Old and New School parties. In April, Amasa Converse, editor of the *Southern Religious Telegraph* of Richmond, Virginia, devoted a series of editorials to the defense of "neutral ground." "We do not think that the preservation of this [orthodox theological] system in its purity in our southern churches requires us or anyone to make an expedition to Boston or Philadelphia in search of an antagonist for the sake of contending; or to open our bosoms to the evil surmisings and jealousies which are at this time circulated through the church in various ways. . . ."¹³ Converse and Gildersleeve, the two leading editorial voices of the southern church, were to differ sharply only a year later on the proper attitude to adopt toward the division which by then was accomplished. But at bottom, they were agreed: they repudiated the doctrinal-disciplinary schism itself and urged the need to be ready for a southern secession.

The *Observer's* premonition of political dealing to come was well grounded. A correspondent of the paper in March wrote that the delegates from the slave-holding states ought to caucus at the time of the meeting of the Assembly; on May 25th, in Pittsburgh, they did. Forty-one commissioned delegates appeared, a formidable bloc of votes. "If the Assembly shall undertake to exercise authority on the subject of slavery so as to make it an immorality or shall in any way declare that Christians are criminal in holding slaves . . . a declaration shall be presented by the southern delegation declining their jurisdiction in the case and our determination not to submit to such a decision. . . ."¹⁴ The ultimatum pointed to the inseparable connection between slavery and civil law, involving even the national constitution; it argued that "slavery is recognized in both the Old and New Testaments as an existing relation and is not condemned by the authority of God—therefore, Resolved: The General Assembly have no authority to assume or exercise jurisdiction in regard to the existence of slavery."¹⁵ The price of the southern bloc was fixed.

As the hour of the critical Assembly approached, trepidation seized the southern men. "The slavery question is next on the docket," wrote Converse's informant, "and it is the prevalent opinion among the southerners that we are to be unchurched by a considerable majority. . . ."¹⁶

Things did not turn out so badly. By a substantial margin all action on slavery was "indefinitely postponed." Technically this meant that it could be thrown into the Assembly at any later date; in custom it meant that slavery was laid to rest by continuing consent. Not every-

one in the South was reassured. Nisbet of Georgia had declared on the floor of the Assembly that the vote to postpone would be considered "a direct assertion of principles wholly at variance with the views and interests of the South"¹⁷ and the commissioners, as instructed, walked out of the Assembly. Less incensed southerners, however, saw that "... a large majority of the Assembly are opposed to legislating upon this subject or to inflicting church censure upon the holding of slaves: yet the most of our northern brethren regard it as sinful." Many felt that the Virginians and some others had been much too hasty in leaving.

It was quite clear to the Old School leadership on the day the Assembly of 1836 ended that they had lost control of the church; that if purity of doctrine were to be preserved, they must effect a separation either by forcing out their opponents, which appeared improbable, or withdrawing; that if it were to be secession, they must take as many Presbyterians as possible into the new body; and that they must be prepared to defend themselves against the charge of schism. Certainly these points lay behind the often quoted remark of John Witherspoon of South Carolina: "The die is cast: the Church is to be divided."¹⁸ Had it not been a southerner that made the statement, fewer historians would have speculated that the remark also comported an agreement that already brought the primary concerns of northern Old School men into alignment with the preoccupation of the South with abolitionism. It is true that Old School leaders were in conference immediately upon the adjournment of the General Assembly of 1836; Staiger has analyzed the committee and shown that it was hostile to abolitionism.¹⁹ The absence of such men as the bold spirits from Chillicothe, Ohio, who believed that slavery was not only sin but that it was the business of the Assembly to say so, at least prepared the way for agreement to come. But there is evidence that Witherspoon was more radical than other southerners. As early as July 1832, he vaguely perceived a connection between the doctrinal-disciplinary issue and abolition agitation at that date, and argued for immediate separation.²⁰ But neither then nor as late as the winter of 1837 is there evidence that there existed in his mind or anyone else's the express view that division along doctrinal-disciplinary lines would pacify the sectional quarrel over slavery. W. H. Foote declares that George Baxter, one of the two or three dominant Old School personalities in the South and well-informed on every aspect of the church crisis, decided only in the Spring of 1837 that the South should so much as send delegates to the Convention that subsequently reconciled grave differences within the Old School over slavery in time to dominate the forthcoming Assembly. Without seeing its exact form, Witherspoon was for radical action, arguing that both Samuel Miller and John Breckinridge of Princeton, with whom Baxter

must be grouped, "take wrong views of the matter."²¹ Even if Wither-
spoon's celebrated remark in 1836 did mean that he had already concluded that an Old School Presbyterianism would be proof against abolitionism—for which there is no specific evidence—he was far from representing the position of the southern Old School leadership which preferred a moderate course.

A division in Presbyterianism, long under discussion, might take two distinct forms. In both North and South, sectional division was contemplated with dismay for fear it would destroy the unity required to preserve Old School Calvinism in a degenerating Presbyterian Church. *The Act of the Virginia Synod*, written by Baxter and southern colleagues who stood with Philadelphia orthodoxy, throws interesting light on the question of the state of southern thinking upon the two possible lines of division. Adopted at Petersburg November 7, 1836, the Act lucidly sets before Presbyterians of Virginia the whole dispute in North and West, touching upon both doctrine and the contest between denominational boards and the independent mission and education agencies. There was need for this, in view of the doughty neutralism of Amasa Converse and others. But the major part of the document is devoted to "one thing which presses with peculiar force on the Presbyterian Church in the South . . . the spirit of abolition as lately developed in some parts of the country."²² The standard southern arguments against abolition doctrine are outlined and the scriptural warrant for slavery stated. Also the constitutional argument is outlined: at the founding of the General Assembly it was agreed that slaveholding should never become a bar to communion in the Presbyterian Church. Having repudiated on principle any future Church action against slavery, the Act concluded: "Synod would add that the likelihood of the necessity of any geographical division through the operation of this fanaticism is not so great as it was some time ago. Yet on this subject, be the danger small or great, a vigilance corresponding to the exigencies of the times is our manifest duty." The five signers affirm unanimous support of the Philadelphia cause and call the whole South to support unity, peace, and "the form of sound words." The document does not argue that the repudiation of the New Divinity would free the South from abolitionist dangers; but in affirming support for the conservative doctrinal-disciplinary cause and deprecating sectional division, a drift toward the conclusions of May 1837 may be discerned.

The critical fact for the South was that it was alone in viewing separation as a possible way of striking free of church abolitionism while the older and more widespread causes of friction bade fair to dominate the coming schism. If this were to happen, which way would

the South turn? She might press for sectional division, aiming to amalgamate Old and New Schools before party virulence set southerners against one another. But if not—and only a few believed that the South was ready for that—in which branch would the slavery issue be least likely to disturb Presbyterians?

There was some uncertainty about the comparative strength of abolitionism in the two branches of Presbyterianism.²³ The fierce conviction of the Chillicothe region stood out in the Old School. Dissatisfied with the moderate course pursued by the main branches, some in that region later withdrew to form the Free Presbyterian Church. Still, most of the petitions before the Assembly were from New School areas. It was in these that Theodore Weld had launched his career as an abolitionist; and he was from Lane Seminary, itself clearly New School under its president, Lyman Beecher. "Some of [the Abolitionists] are furious," the correspondent of the *Southern Religious Telegraph* had written after the close of the Assembly of 1836. "Some on this account withdrew from the administration of the Lord's Supper by the members of the Assembly. Men of this stamp are from Ohio, Indiana, and especially the western part of New York; and most of them, I think, are New School. I am persuaded that we have much less to fear in this matter from the Old School than from the New School party. . . . I am persuaded that New Schoolism will not do for the South. I cannot be ultra on either side but I must be Old School in theological views."²⁴

Why was the pro-slavery cause disposed toward the Old School while abolitionism was rooted more strongly among advocates of the New Divinity? It is easy to assume a connection between the optimistic view of human ability held by the later "Edwardians" and their insistence on freeing slaves. Staiger points to this kinship of ideas as a tie between New School theology and anti-slavery policy. In historical fact, the correspondence was occasional rather than systematic. Such lions in the Old School as R. J. Breckinridge; Thomas D. Baird, editor of the *Pittsburgh Christian Herald*; John W. Nevin, a Pittsburgh theological professor; and Joshua L. Wilson of Cincinnati, the western Old School champion, were profoundly hostile to slavery.²⁵ Breckinridge refrained from introducing it into the General Assembly only because of an equally strong conviction that civil matters did not belong in church courts. Furthermore, the southern New School Church went far beyond northern Presbyterians of either school in vindicating slavery theologically and was not exceeded in vehemence by James Henley Thornwell himself, the ablest theologian and social theorist among the southern Old School men.²⁶

The action of the General Assembly of 1836 is also pertinent to this question. This body cleared Albert Barnes, the standard bearer

of the New School, of all Old School charges; revoked the agreement to transfer the Western Foreign Mission Society of Pittsburgh to the care of the Assembly, a favorite Old School cause; and in numerous other ways appears conspicuous among the "New School Assemblies." But it was just this Assembly that refused to take a strong stand on slavery, voting 154 to 57 for indefinite postponement of all action condemning it. Even when full allowance is made for the political pressure exerted by the Virginia and other Southern commissioners,²⁷ such a decision is inconceivable on the assumption that any commanding kinship between New School theology and abolition existed in the minds of the commissioners.

The notion of a bond between Old School doctrine and slaveholding policy assumes that it is a general truth that action arises from doctrine, which is scarcely correct at this juncture of Presbyterian history. Quite the contrary was true: Presbyterians had already fully embarked upon a period in which, to an unusual degree, policy tended to produce its own vindication in theological and social doctrine. The development of pro-slavery thought in the South is the most painful example of this,²⁸ but it reappears in "Old" Calvinist Presbyterian thought throughout the nineteenth century, as in Charles Hodge's sturdy vindication of the "divine right of private property" in interpreting the eighth commandment.²⁹ If the New School called slaveholding sin because a man is free to set his slaves at liberty, Old School abolitionists might as properly blame it on the sinful state of society and advocate general reform. Such in fact was the drift of thought not only in the Chillicothe Presbytery but in the Synod of Indiana as well.³⁰ In the founding of the Free Presbyterian Church in 1847, both Old and New School ministers joined. Abolitionism and pro-slavery sectionalism proved equally capable of submerging theological differences. The pointed question that the abolition press put to the country—"Is Slaveholding Sin?"—is not to be construed primarily as an implication of the New School anthropology but as a weapon ready-forged for conflict by the massive moralism of America in this century. If it could be demonstrated that slavery was sin, all religious Americans, not just adherents of the New Divinity, would be bound to accept abolitionism as a holy cause.

During the year leading to the decisive Assembly of 1837, the South was occupied in debate upon the proper course to pursue. "If the South cannot look for peace and rest in the Assembly on the slavery question, is it not time for all the southern Presbyteries to refuse unanimously to send their representatives to that judicatory?" asked "a respected son of Virginia."³¹ The partisanship of Philadelphia still seemed no affair of the South. "When party men in different portions of the church are carrying on a secret correspondence for the purpose

of effecting a division," wrote Amasa Converse, "the state of things appears to us critical. . . ." ³² The South ought to form its own Assembly.

Against this was the impression among returning delegates that the situation in the Assembly did not require a regional separation at this time; and in the South as a whole, Presbyterian opinion was not prepared for the step. Furthermore, the Assembly of 1836 had stimulated serious interest in the doctrinal issue so long vexed in North and West. Even editors who deprecated the quarrel began to publish serials on doctrine, the history of New England, and controversial letters on theology and church order.

With the exception of a few Hopkinsians in East Tennessee, heirs of Hezekiah Balch, and the small group that had followed W. C. Davis into the Independent Presbyterian Church in South Carolina, the South had never been anything but Old School—but, like Pittsburgh, always non-controversially so. Once the doctrinal questions were illuminated, it was immediately plain where the South belonged. "Until I came here I was under the impression that we were warring about words," a correspondent to the *Southern Religious Telegraph* had written from the Assembly of 1836. "I now think differently. . . ." ³³ The *Telegraph* still argued that the differences did not warrant division; but hostile as Amasa Converse was to the political machinations of Philadelphia, he never for a moment professed any difference with the Westminster Confession or established church standards. If he favored liberty of theological inquiry and sympathized with the desire of revivalism for a morally responsible viewpoint, he still found division unconscionable. Since neither side was *really* heretical, he reasoned, the debate must reflect a struggle for power in Philadelphia; and since the cardinal concerns of the South were steadily ignored in the doctrinal-disciplinary dispute, the South ought to forsake it and serve her own necessities.

The contest in Virginia was not only between two kinds of division in the church, sectional or doctrinal-disciplinary. It was also a personal test of influence between Amasa Converse and William Swan Plumer. Neither of these men monopolized leadership of his own opinion-group. George Baxter was at least as important as Plumer and William Hill, who assailed Hodge's massive Old School apologetic, stood on the New School side independently of Converse. But Plumer and Converse addressed Virginia from Richmond. Their conflict became a matter of public record when Plumer founded the *Watchman of the South* in August of 1837 to enlist public opinion against Converse's views. He strove to persuade Virginians that the Philadelphia viewpoint was more valid for the South than they had supposed. Immediately after the closing of the General Assembly, there appeared a

rash of protests against the division voted in southern presbyteries and synods.³⁴ But Plumer was dramatically successful in his opposition to Converse. One by one, the Southern judicatories voted support for the acts of the 1837 Assembly and affiliated with the continuing Old School body, and within a year Converse transferred his press and paper to Philadelphia, where he remained until closed by order of President Lincoln for opposition to the federal position.³⁵

Whatever private thinking may have been done in 1836, the dividing of the Presbyterian Church remained to be accomplished and the Old School committee appointed in June 1836 had by now summoned a planning convention to meet just preceding the Assembly of 1837. It was quite clear that something must be done there about slavery. The Anti-Slavery Society was reporting at its spring convention that it had established 483 new groups, bringing the total to 1006. Seventy agents had been added to their staff; publications distributed, principally pamphlets regarded in the South as incendiary, totalled 669,387.³⁶ Samuel Miller took account of this agitation and wrote hopefully to a Virginian, "Our abolitionist brethren, by the course which they pursue, are every day deeply wounding the cause of religion . . . and indulging in conduct adapted to plunge both the church and state into calamities which they can never repair. . . . I cling to the hope that a large majority of our church will frown on the conduct of those brethren and refuse to take another step of concurrence with a course so demented and destructive."³⁷

Vastly more significant for the rapprochement of conservative North and sensitive South was an article published in April 1836 by Charles Hodge in the voice of Princeton, the *Biblical Repertory*.³⁸ Reviewing William Ellery Channing's new indictment of slavery, Hodge had stated his agreement with the Southern argument that the Scriptures not only do not condemn slavery but recognize it without rebuke as a legitimate part of society. Christ "hardly alluded" to it; "the apostles refer to it, not to pronounce upon it as a question of morals, but to prescribe the relative duties of masters and slaves." From this he concluded, against Channing, that "slaveholding is not necessarily sinful." This was a critical point; a Southerner who wistfully wished its extinction would become as inflamed as any secessionist by this charge upon his morals.

Hodge also wounded abolitionism. The driving power of the movement in the West was not economic common-sense or diffuse good will; it was the evangelical conviction of guilt. The intimate kinship between abolitionism and the revivals conducted by Finney is dramatically clear in a statement made in 1834 at Boston by one Rev. Mr. Phelps, an agent of the Anti-Slavery Society. "The main reliance of

reformers must be on motives addressed to the conscience. Men must be made to feel that their conduct is really iniquitous in the sight of God before any thorough-going reform will take place. . . . Hence in this great cause the necessity of stripping slavery of every disguise, presenting it in its naked enormity before the community, and calling it by its right name. . . ."³⁹

Hodge struck at the center: "Everything . . . is conceded which the abolitionist need require when it is granted that slaveholding is in itself a crime. But how can this assumption be reconciled with the conduct of Christ and the apostles? . . . It cannot be that slaveholding belongs to the same category with . . . [lying, drunkenness, murder, adultery]; and to assert the contrary is to assert that Christ is the minister of sin."⁴⁰ He soothed the prickling conscience of the South. "The great duty of the South is not emancipation; but improvement." And slavery does not *inevitably* entail the abuse of man; since it does not, concluded the Princeton mentor, there exists such a thing as a Christian morality of slavery and to this a sound Southerner will dedicate himself.

Scarcely anything could have better fostered trust than this authoritative expression from "The Seminary of the Presbyterian Church." That Hodge was perhaps the most conservative man there did not count; already he was becoming the Catechist of the Church and the South sensed significance in his utterance.

Convictions being formed by Hodge and other middle men were not yet explicit; what lay visible was the familiar determination to withdraw from the church at the slightest suggestion of hostility on the test issue. The southern presbyteries now elected full representations to the convention, feeling hope in the influence of men like Miller and Hodge.

The Old School in the North, West, and border states desperately needed the support of the Southern delegates. Foote states that "the parties agitating the Assembly were so equally divided in numbers, talent, wealth and intelligence that the southern vote, hitherto pledged on neither side, would give the desired and decisive majority in the Assembly."⁴¹ Both sides had exerted themselves to bring full strength to bear in this critical Assembly but there was genuine doubt as to the outcome. By tradition of belief, the South belonged with the Old School; one thing remained to threaten its solidarity. Realists in the North were as deeply concerned as any Southerner that this issue within the party should be resolved.

But there were problems. Not only had the South asked an explicit declaration that the church never *would* act on slavery; a demand was rising for the abrogation of the Act of 1812.⁴² This would re-

quire, in effect, that slavery be declared out of the realm of morals and religion. As many southerners realized, the overwhelming feeling in the North, regardless of party affiliations, was that slavery must eventually be done away. Some in the South knew quite well that to attack the Presbyterian past would bring against them principled men like Robert J. Breckinridge. They also knew that Breckinridge firmly believed slavery to be no affair of the church and that he would favor its exclusion from ecclesiastical consideration. Here was the obvious way out, if only the southern radicals could be silenced and the dispute kept out of the preliminary Convention.

Breckinridge took the lead in the Convention. He first sketched the frame of the church problem: Biblical doctrines denied, Presbyterian order violated, subversive associations doing their mischievous work unrestrained, entire branches of the Church—presbyteries and synods—lost to fellowship. Professor George Baxter, who had been elected chairman of the Convention, then emphasized the threat to Old School control entailed in the presence of certain “northern” delegates and remarked that “the parties concerned” should not be seated until their title to their seats had been clarified. If this were done, he said, “it would soon occasion such a removal as would leave the orthodox in a decided majority. The exclusion of the Synod of the Western Reserve would of itself secure to them that majority.”⁴³ Recognizing that the doctrinal issue was still not fully clear to the South, Baxter advocated a commission to “put matters in such a train as might lead to the removal of all difficulties.” The procedure, he argued, was sanctioned by Scottish practice and was in the spirit of Presbyterianism.

On the second day, Breckinridge spoke openly of slavery. Here was the rock that might well wreck the Convention.⁴⁴ The true controversy in the church, he said, concerned doctrine and order. “He deprecated bringing in any other concern, no matter what, and mixing it up with matters of this vital and sacred character.” Although slavery was mentioned in one of the papers submitted to the convention, he declared that he would not discuss it. He had “irrevocably made up his mind and he was willing to live or to go to the stake on the principles he held in regard to it.” Slavery was a subject “totally foreign from Presbyterianism. If the convention was to be arrayed on one side or the other of the slavery question, he had no doubt that the great and primary subject which had brought them together would quickly be superseded and overlaid by the new topic of discussion. It was vain to deny that this was a question more dangerous to the church than even the other. Wherever it came, it swallowed up all other questions, like Aaron’s rod.”

Breckinridge then pointed to the past. The vexing question had been settled long since by actions as early as 1787. The Assembly had been satisfied again and again with those pronouncements and "there he took his stand." He would tolerate neither the abolitionists who wanted the church riven for their own purposes nor "brethren [who] wanted them to unsay and to eat up that which had been said by their fathers. . . . They came to the convention in this arduous and trying crisis and required them to change their principles on the penalty of losing their aid in the season of distress. In this he thought there was peculiar unfriendliness and unfaithfulness too to the truth of God and to the Lord of the Church. . . ." Then he offered compromise as a permanent policy of Old School Presbyterianism: "For one he should set his face as a flint against the introduction of the subject in any form, either into the convention or assembly. He could not take one step, a hair's breadth, or the thousandth part of a hair's breadth, away from that ground on which the Presbyterian church had stood ever since it was a church. He was going to lay no burden on men which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. . . . Never would he consent that it should be mooted at all, until the church had first got back upon sound and orthodox ground. . . ."

When at length he sat down, Dr. Breckinridge was asked whether the heritage of principle so precious to him was contained in the deliverances of 1818. This was the critical moment in the political crisis of Old School Presbyterianism. Breckinridge chose unity and replied that it was not to the offensive document of 1818 that he alluded but to 1816—a brief and less provocative declaration that slavery was an evil that must eventually be abandoned. J. L. Wilson took the same course when asked why he had not spoken out against slavery. "I believe I shall let the southern brethren manage their own concerns in their own way," he replied.⁴⁵

The crisis was past but the southern presbyteries had not yet given their vote. Would the promise of silence suffice in a church containing leaders who were avowed enemies of slavery? Concern for doctrine was new to the South; could her pastors and people believe that theology and order were the cardinal problems of the church? Would the South agree that the slavery issue should take second place?

George Baxter and William Swan Plumer of Richmond now threw their full weight behind the compromise. "During the sessions of the convention letters were written from Philadelphia by southern gentlemen stating that the conventionalists had in conclave an understanding upon the subject of slavery which would accomplish much in the Assembly. . . ."⁴⁶ This was picked up quickly by the *Cincinnati Journal*, which charged that southern votes had been bought: ". . . the

North was to aid the South in cutting off abolitionists and the South was to render a like service to the North in cutting off those called New School men."⁴⁷ In July, Converse found this incredible: "we consider it as due to [the commissioners from Virginia and North Carolina] as gentlemen and Christians to say that they are incapable of 'log-rolling' of this kind. . . . They are not the men, whatever influence abolitionism might have on their minds, to form a coalition of this sort to cut off abolitionists." A month later Converse was not so sure, for by then Plumer had published a lengthy argument aimed to persuade the South that in the Old School she had nothing to fear from abolitionism. The conclusion is unavoidable: whatever form it may have taken, there was an explicit understanding and a binding agreement that the Old School abolitionists would, for conviction and convenience, oppose any church declaration on slavery. Their safety thus assured, the South voted solidly for the excision of the Synods of Western Reserve, Genesee, Geneva, and Utica.

It remained for the southern leadership to interpret the decision of the Convention to the rank and file of southern Presbyterians. Two points had to be fully established: that the division which had occurred was justified by the gravity of the doctrinal and disciplinary crisis; that the Old School included few abolitionists and they would never force the South. Baxter and Plumer worked at the task of interpretation through the summer of 1837. They knew there would be a test in 1838; they wanted the South solidly behind the excising acts. Baxter put the question candidly to the students of Union Seminary and the southern public: "Another advantage of the course pursued, if it be sustained and carried out by the churches, is that it will put an end to the abolition question and disturbance in the Presbyterian Church. I always had the impression that the abolition spirit must be principally in the New-school and the good old Presbyterians with whom I had been acquainted could not be carried away with that fanatical system. . . . I found our northern friends reasonable and prudent on the subject of slavery and we conversed about it in the style of former times before the fanaticism of abolition had infected the public. In the Convention there were 124 members, upwards of one hundred were members also of the Assembly, and among these were but two abolitionists. These were from the Presbytery of Chillicothe and they professed to be very moderate.

"In the Assembly, with the exception of those Chillicothe members, I do not believe that there was a single abolitionist among the orthodox, whilst nearly the whole of the New-school were of that description. Vast bundles of petitions and memorials were sent to the Assembly from the New-school Churches, some of them, as we were

told, were signed by five hundred ladies. All these papers were handed over to the Committee on Bills and Overtures, by whom they were suppressed as soon as their subject was known, without reading. Dr. Beman, who was a member of that Committee, used his privilege of appealing to the House and brought up the question whether those papers should or should not be read in the Assembly. At this time our only orthodox abolitionists had left the house, and on the trial of the question, every orthodox vote was against the reading, and every New-school vote in favour of it, with the exception of a few men, who lived in a slave-holding country. . . .

"During the meeting of the General Assembly, frequent abolition meetings were held in Philadelphia. . . . At these meetings, most of the leading members of the New-school side delivered addresses, but I believe none of the orthodox attended. A clergyman of my acquaintance . . . told me that he had lately travelled through most of the Synods declared to be out of the Assembly and that he found them to be mere hot-beds of abolition, that he seldom heard a family prayer or a grace before meal which did not contain some abolition petitions. From these facts and from others which I could mention, I have no doubt that if the acts of the General Assembly should be properly sustained and the separation begun should be carried out, the Presbyterian Church, by getting clear of the New-school, will, at the same time, get clear of abolition."⁴⁸

Many of the facts cited by Baxter were later shown to be mistaken—for example, exclusive New School support for the abolition meetings—and he equated the word "abolitionist" *not* with persons favoring abolition but only with those who favored its introduction into the Assembly. Thus he did not include Breckinridge among abolitionists! The bias of Baxter and Plumer was fully exposed by Amasa Converse in a bitter campaign pleading the injustice of the excising acts and the cynicism of making the decision in the doctrinal question depend on fears of abolitionism, but to no avail. The future was to prove Baxter and Plumer right and Converse wrong. The Old School did absolutely exclude the question of slavery; it was the disruption of the federal Union that brought the establishment of a Presbyterian Church of the Confederacy.

Converse's indignant reaction to the excision failed to persuade the southern presbyteries. Satisfied with the judgment of Baxter and Plumer, they voted with scattered exceptions in the border states and mountain areas to approve the reforming acts of 1837. Most southern commissioners to the Assembly of 1838 were instructed to pursue the course set in 1837.

Although the acts of excision gave the Assembly of 1837 great

prominence in the minds of Presbyterians, it was no more than a culmination of a struggle whose lines were already clearly drawn in 1831. The second trial of Albert Barnes; the acrimonious controversy in Philadelphia in press, presbyteries, and Synod; the numerous party documents of protest and reform added little. The events that made the difference between 1831, when the Old School sentiment was submerged in moderatism, and 1837-38, when Old School political majorities dominated the Assembly, were two: the shift of the center toward radical action, under pounding criticism of the theology of New England, the mixed polity of the western presbyteries, and the cooperative agencies for missions and education; and the negotiations which convinced the South that it was safe from abolitionism in the Old School.

Any wavering in the South would have been fatal to the Old School in 1837. Everything possible had been done to win the older Presbyterianism of the Middle Atlantic States but it remained divided. Supporting votes from outside were essential. Against the Philadelphia leadership was arrayed a solid bloc of New School people: two score votes from the four suspect Synods and an equivalent number of known sympathizers from other regions. As in national politics, the strength of the South lay in its ability to decide the issue with its vote: there were sixty-four delegates from slaveholding synods, excluding Missouri.

Did schism come as a direct effect of the agitation of the slavery-abolition debate in Presbyterianism?

It is difficult to light on the "beginning point" of the great Presbyterian controversy—perhaps the publication of Ezra Stiles Ely's *Contrast Between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism* in 1811 marks it—but from the outbreak of debate in Philadelphia in 1816 to the schism the drum-roll of controversy grew steadily more insistent. Radical Old School men anticipated division before the abolitionist crusade was fairly launched and the commitments of the leaders of both Schools to their respective positions were beyond reconciliation by 1831. After that date the harmonizing of viewpoints was out of the question; the unity of the Church was preserved by a political policy of compromise. It is doubtful whether the ascendancy of the moderates could have extended much beyond 1834 when it yielded to a see-saw battle between the Schools for domination of the Assembly. The South apart, an eventual break-up of Presbyterianism was certain. The slavery-abolition issue did not cause the schism; but the South played a role of the utmost significance by giving the Old School the victory and assuring the continuance of a non-sectional Presbyterian denomination until the outbreak of the Civil War.

The situation at the Assembly of 1838 was less critical, for the commissioners from the excinded synods were denied their seats at the

outset. Yet in its own way, 1838 was a test year. Had the South not given assent to the excinding acts of 1837 and decided instead for regional secession, the cause of "reform" would have been lost. Without the South, the Old School Assembly of 1839 would have convened with one third fewer members. Old School Presbyterianism would have been a secession movement in 1837 and upon its leadership would have fallen the odium of schism.

Having successfully held the South, however, the Old School emerged with control of a uniform, well-organized denomination capable of educating its ministry, supporting its boards, and steering a prudent course through provocations that were destined to split every major Protestant denomination except the Episcopalians before the Civil War. The price it paid was the opprobrium of being, if not a pro-slavery church, at least one which refused to take a stand on the pressing issue of the time.

The role of the South between 1835 and 1838 was perhaps most significant for the moral development of the Presbyterian tradition. The agreement to be silent on slavery meant that majority Presbyterianism had affirmed that this overarching issue of national and private morals was unrelated to the corporate custom and teaching of the Church. The slavery issue was not the last occasion when Presbyterians would confront the vexing question of the Church's moral stance in American society. Enormously important for the future, therefore, was Old School Presbyterianism's affirmation that the principle of separation of ecclesiastical from civil politics might also be understood as a distinction between religion and public morals.⁴⁹

1. "Some Significant Factors in American Church History," *Journal of Religion (JR)*, VII, (Jan. 1927), 13.
2. As regards Presbyterians, in *Religion on the American Frontier*, II, *The Presbyterians, 1783-1840*. (New York, 1936). 110-125; 744-751; 827-887, *passim*.
3. The most notable spokesman of the pro-slavery New School was Frederick A. Ross, a member of the New School majority in Holston Presbytery, East Tennessee, which "renounced the jurisdiction of the true General Assembly . . ." in October 1838, as it was expressed by the Old School minority. Ross' pro-slavery views are spread over the pages of the journal he edited: *The Presbyterian Witness*, Knoxville, Tenn. January 1851 until October 25, 1860. Most of this journal is in the collection of the Historical Foundation, Montreat, N.C. Cf. also his *Slavery Ordained of God* (Philadelphia, 1857). Also Armstrong, Geo. D., *The Christian Doctrine of Slavery* (New York, 1857).
4. Sweet, *op. cit.*, 858.
5. *A History of the New School . . .* (Philadelphia 1868).
6. "Abolitionism and the Presbyterian Church Schism, 1837-38." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXXVI, 391 ff.
7. Barnes, Gilbert, and Dumond, Dwight, eds. *The Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld and Angelina Grimke Weld and Sarah Grimke, 1822-1844* (New York, 1934). I, 224.
8. *Ibid.*, 228.
9. The theory developed in the South in support of slavery is set forth in the study of William Sumner Jenkins, *Pro-slavery Thought in the Old South*, (University of North Carolina Press, 1935).
10. *Charleston Observer*, Benjamin Gildersleeve, ed. April 16, 1836.
11. *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1835* (Philadelphia, 1836), 33.

12. *Charleston Observer*, April 16, 1836, 66.
13. Issue of April 15, 1836. Staiger states that "the Old School North's suggestion of a united orthodox front was favorably received by the majority of southern journals." (*Op. cit.*, 405.) Among the exceptions was perhaps the most ably edited, the *Southern Religious Telegraph*. Evidence of reluctance in the judicatories of the South is cited in Sweet, *op. cit.*, 844. The men who subsequently became advocates of doctrinal-disciplinary division were keenly aware of the dependence of South upon northern aid. W. H. Foote observes that George Baxter, for example, was slow to commit himself to any kind of division (*Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical*. Second Series [Philadelphia, 1855], 511). The Union Theological Seminary, where he was principal professor, could not survive financially without the North. His decision against sectional division left northern assistance to Union Seminary undamaged.
14. *Charleston Observer*, June 11, 1836.
15. *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.* There is ample evidence of widespread indifference in the South to the northern quarrel. Cf. Foote, *op. cit.*, 520.
16. *Southern Religious Telegraph*, June 7, 1836.
17. *Charleston Observer*, May 30, 1836. Cf. *Southern Religious Telegraph*, June 24, 1836.
18. Gillett, Ezra H. *History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*. Rev. ed. (Philadelphia, 1864), II, 496n.
19. *Op. cit.*, 403f.
20. Cf. Gillett, *op. cit.*, II, 524. In a letter to Shepard Kollock of North Carolina, dated July 14, 1832, Witherspoon states: "Why then bind together in one church under one constitution, men who can never agree? Are there not many hundred ministers in our church who will not exchange pulpits? And many more professing christians who think those that differ from them destitute of piety? Does not A. Tappan and others North think that no slaveholder can be a christian? (and is not this a pretty common opinion there—'tho a concealed one on the part of many for the sake of peace?') Now then I say, let these heterogeneous [*sic*] parties separate. . . . Let there be openly what there is secretly, two presbyterian churches in the United States." (Kollock papers, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia). Abolitionist views are here cited as evidence that unity is already lost to Presbyterianism. Witherspoon had apparently not pressed his line of thought to the point of asking whether the failure of respect between North and South over slavery corresponded or did not correspond to the disharmony caused by other disputes.
21. Foote, *op. cit.*, 512. Letter to Kollock, January 4, 1837. Further evidence of Witherspoon's radicalism is found in a letter dated August 25, 1835, in which he questioned the doctrinal reliability of William S. Plumer, suggesting that he exhibited too much sympathy with Converse's New School views. Witherspoon raised similar questions about other southerners who proved to be Old School stalwarts and perfectly "safe" on the slavery issue.
22. *Ibid.*, 507.
23. Gillett, *op. cit.*, 496ff.
24. *Southern Religious Telegraph*, June 24, 1836.
25. Wilson expressed himself unequivocally to Belamy Storer, a member of the national House of Representatives in a letter of January 21, 1836 reproduced in Sweet, *op. cit.*, p. 744ff. Cf. also Hightower, Raymond L. "Joshua L. Wilson, Frontier Controversialist," *Church History*, III, 308. Nevins' views are displayed in a letter to Theodore Weld explaining the necessity of refusing to address an abolition meeting: *Weld-Grimké Letters*, I, 222. Breckinridge spoke for himself in his own papers and articles; his general position is competently reviewed in Moore, Edmund. "Robert J. Breckinridge and the Slavery Aspect of the Presbyterian Schism of 1837," *CH*, IV, 282ff. Exceptions to the general rule that New School views implied abolitionism and Old School views tolerated slavery are so numerous that this whole thesis must be called into question. This discrepancy is noted, among others, by Pendleton, Othniel A., Jr. "Slavery and the Evangelical Churches," *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society*, XXV, 88, 153; and by Kull, Irving Stoddard. "Presbyterian Attitudes toward Slavery," *CH*, VII, 101, who stresses the economic forces that bore equally on Old and New Schools South.
26. Cf. Smith, H. Shelton. "The Church and the Social Order in the Old South as Interpreted by James Henley Thornwell," *CH*, VII, 115. A later report by Thornwell to the Synod of South Carolina sums up his thinking very adequately: *JPHS*, XXIX, p. 10. Also the *Southern Presbyterian Review*, *passim*.
27. This political move is described by Kuhns, Frederick. "Slavery and Missions in the Old Northwest," *JPHS*, XXIV, 214f., notes 51 and 52. He suggests that their "threats of secession . . . estopped the Assembly from antislavery action of any kind." Had there existed a dominant bond between New School theological and social doctrine, the southern threat would

- probably not have inhibited all action, as occurred, but driven the church to immediate division along a line cleanly separating New School—abolition from Old School tolerance of slaveholding.
28. Jenkins, *op. cit.*, passim.
 29. *Systematic Theology* (New York, 1872-73), III, 426.
 30. Records of the Synod of Indiana, *JPHS*, XXXIV, 266-271.
 31. *Southern Religious Telegraph*, July 8, 1836.
 32. *Ibid.*, loc. cit.
 33. *Ibid.*, June 4, 1836.
 34. The texts of some of these protests may be found in the *Watchman of the South*, II, 38.
 35. Cf. Foote, *op. cit.*, 506-510; Staiger, *op. cit.*, 406.
 36. *Southern Religious Telegraph*, May 19, 1837.
 37. Letter to McElheny of Virginia, *Charleston Observer*, April 15, 1837.
 38. Issue of April, 1836, 275.
 39. *Southern Religious Telegraph*, May 16, 1834. Quoted from the *New York Observer*. See also Weld-Grimke *Letters*, Introduction, ix f.
 40. *Biblical Repertory*, *op. cit.*, 277f.
 41. *Op. cit.*, 511.
 42. *Southern Religious Telegraph*, August 18, 1837. William S. Plumer read a lengthy paper in the Convention arguing that neither Convention nor Assembly might act on slavery. Foote, *op. cit.*, 513.
 43. *New York Observer*, May 20, 1837.
 44. Foote, *op. cit.*, 520.
 45. *Ibid.*, loc. cit.
 46. *Southern Religious Telegraph*, August 18, 1837.
 47. *Ibid.*, July 9, 1837.
 48. *Charleston Observer*, August 26, 1837.
 49. The problem of slavery in Presbyterianism in the period of division is further treated in the following articles: Boison, Anton T. "Divided Protestantism in a Midwest County." *JR*, XX, 359ff. Lyons, John F. "The Attitude of Presbyterianism in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois toward Slavery, 1825-1861." *JPHS*, XI, 69ff. Van Court, J. H. "An Account of the Work of Rev. James Smylie. . . ." *JPHS*, XXI, 20. Welsh, E. B. "Chillicothe, a Distinguished Rural Presbytery." *JPHS*, XXIII, 187ff. The following theses deal with the problem: Barber, Verle Lyndon. *The Slavery Controversy and the Presbyterians*. Univ. of Chicago (M. A. thesis), June 1928. Hare, John C. *The Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, 1837-1870*. Univ. of Pittsburgh (Ph.D. thesis), 1951. Baker, R. A. *Pro-slavery Arguments of Southern Religious Leaders as Illustrated by the Old School Presbyterians*. University of Chicago (M.A. thesis), 1935. Hohman, Elmo P. *The Attitude of the Presbyterian Church in the United States toward American Slavery*. University of Illinois (M.A. thesis), 1917. Mick, Laura A. *The Presbyterians in the Anti-slavery Movement in the United States, with special Reference to that Part of the Church not in Contact with New England Abolitionism*. Ohio State University (M.A. thesis), 1934.

TOM BROWN'S SCHOOLDAYS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF "MUSCULAR CHRISTIANITY"

WILLIAM E. WINN

The Broad Church movement, of which "muscular Christianity" was one of the most influential expressions, represented a type of liberalism within the Church of England. Benjamin Jowett claimed that the name "Broad Church" was first proposed in his hearing by Arthur Hugh Clough and that it had become a familiar term in circles at Oxford a few years before 1850.¹ In July 1850, A. P. Stanley, writing on the Gorham controversy in the *Edinburgh Review*, said that the Church of England was "by the very conditions of its being, not High or Low, but Broad."² The term "Broad Church," however only began to be used generally from October 1853, when an unsigned article by W. J. Conybeare, entitled "Church Parties," appeared, also in the *Edinburgh Review*. F. D. Maurice believed that Conybeare invented the name.

In the years previous to 1850 the Evangelicals had begun to lose much of their vigor, and their hold upon the public was not so strong as it had been during the prior generation. This was largely due to their increased narrowness and rigidity, as the traditional doctrines became more fixed and technical, and to their neglect of general learning. In his article, W. J. Conybeare wrote concerning a dominant wing of the Evangelical party:

Dr. Arnold has justly described their literary organs as "a true specimen of the party, with their infinitely little minds, disputing about anise and cummin, when heaven and earth are coming together around them." And he defines an Evangelical of this class to be "a good Christian, with low understanding, a bad education, and ignorance of the world." The only objection to this definition is that their ignorance is not limited to worldly affairs, but extends impartially to things sacred and profane.³

A period of skeptical languor throughout England had set in. Neither a disintegrating Evangelicalism nor a failing Oxford movement could relieve powerful minds of doubts resulting from the findings of natural scientists and German theologians. Many intellectuals went into the wilderness in search of something in which they might believe. J. A. Froude, the historian, once a disciple of Newman, took refuge in Carlyism; Arthur Hugh Clough, the poet, broke away from Oxford and resigned his fellowship; F. W. Newman wrote the *Phases of Faith* and gave up his early Evangelicalism; Matthew Arnold broke with

orthodoxy and wrote poems of divine despair; Frederick Robertson struggled for his faith and John Sterling's faith disappeared.

But out of this skepticism and connected with it there arose the religious influence which was to the middle of the nineteenth century what Low Churchmen were to its beginning. Coleridge's teachings were the main source of the Broad Church movement, beginning with his *Aids to Reflection* of 1825. Another important source was the teachings of Thomas Arnold. Coleridge and Arnold were both champions of liberty and both encouraged broad learning. Coleridge died in 1834 and Arnold died as a fairly young man in 1842, but both only "lived in the seedtime, not in the time of the harvest, which began about 1848 and which in a sense has continued ever since."⁴

The name "Broad Church" has often been misinterpreted. Indeed, F. D. Maurice, whom popular usage has designated as the chief theologian of the movement, denied as late as 1860 that he knew what "Broad Church" meant. He suggested that if it meant anything, it applied to the followers of Archbishop Whately with whom he did not wish to be identified. However, Maurice, who hated parties above all things, would not have objected to being identified with the term as it was used in Stanley's article of 1850. Stanley merely insisted that the Established Church was not a party and that the history and constitution of the Church of England allowed for all different sides of spiritual truth. But Conybeare, in his 1853 article, used the name in a party sense as applying to those Liberal teachers who had long existed in the Church of England, along with Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals.

Much confusion has arisen from the fact that following the violent controversy which started in 1860 over the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, there was a tendency to label all liberals within the Church of England as "Broad Churchmen" without taking into consideration the extreme differences among these liberals. Although the Broad Church movement was never organized in any way, it did contain two distinct groups of liberal thinkers. The first group was closely associated with Oxford and tended to be more critical and theoretical than the second group which was composed mainly of men who had been students at Cambridge. The first included Whately, Dr. Arnold, Stanley, Matthew Arnold and Jowett. These men were predominantly Aristotelians in that they placed great stress upon formal logic. Like Aristotle they emphasized the importance of collecting, arranging and classifying facts, and, again like Aristotle, they tended to think of God as first cause of things rather than as Person. The second group included Coleridge, Wordsworth, Maurice, and in many respects Tennyson and Browning. These men were predominantly Platonic in method. They were interested in facts, but, like Plato, they were interested much more

in principles.⁵ They tended to think of God in personal terms. Both groups generally welcomed progress in science and in the textual criticism of the Bible, but the second was less hostile to tradition and to church authority than the first. The men in the first group were of necessity completely out of sympathy with the Oxford movement, which was partly a reaction against their kind of liberalism. On the other hand, the Cambridge group, although often in opposition to the Oxford movement, held much in common with the leaders of that movement. These Broad Churchmen, taken together, were united against terrorism and the suppression of truth and thus became the medium through which the Church gradually regained contact with the modern forces in the world. They greatly contributed to the contraction of the sphere of the pure fundamentalism of High Churchmen like Pusey and Evangelicals like Bishop Samuel Wilberforce.

Related to both of these groups within the Broad Church movement was what came to be called "muscular Christianity." The two most influential leaders of this development were Charles Kingsley and Thomas Hughes, author of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, probably the most important book ever to be written about Public Schools.

Muscular Christianity first made its appearance in Kingsley's novels, especially in *Westward Ho!*, the novel which proved to be such a powerful propaganda agent in the recruitment of soldiers for the Crimean War. Although Kingsley was the founder of muscular Christianity, he detested the phrase and asserted bitterly that he had received the label at the time when he was active in the Christian Socialist campaign.⁶

In the development of his muscular Christianity, Kingsley was indebted to F. D. Maurice for the belief in God's law—the thesis that all things advance steadily from worse to better. But the primary influence was Thomas Carlyle. From Carlyle, Kingsley took over the gospel of work and a love for Old Testament morality.

Early in his studies Carlyle had become acquainted with the traditions and legends of Scandinavia, and he conceived a strong affection for the Vikings. Later he combined the romance of the Northmen with English industry in such a way that labor took on a poetical significance.

He combined his observation of prosaic facts with his collection of poetical material. The Northmen were the heroes in whom he delighted, and he made them the heroes of his poem of industry. . . . By thus awakening the associations of a remote past, and filling up the background of his picture with the shadowy forms of giants, doubly to be revered because, like Greek demigods, they were slated to be the progenitors of modern labourers, he gave to the scene of industry a fanciful glow.⁷

Carlyle had also been attracted by the Hebrew prophets. It was in their language that he veiled his admiration of force and vigorously

denounced his adversaries. The *Saturday Review* complained thus of Kingsley's imitation of Carlyle:

Mr. Kingsley constantly assures us that every prosperous farmer is a Viking, and that whatever happens is in accordance with Mr. Kingsley's fancy of God's will; and he states this with such an easy simplicity, that we see not only how congenial Mr. Carlyle's teaching is to him, but how absolutely he is incapable of criticising any set of opinions or forms of expression that once take hold of his imagination.⁸

Kingsley's governing idea "consisted in a high appreciation of the perfection to which manhood might be brought."⁹ "I have to preach the divineness of the whole manhood. . ."¹⁰ The world belonged to God, he would say, not to the Devil. He detested the view that bodily weakness could be identified with spiritual strength and disliked all forms of asceticism and Manicheism. There was no place in his thought for celibacy in either man or woman. Indeed, he went so far as to suggest that the love of a man for a woman was the greatest force for good in the world. The *Saint's Tragedy*, his book about Saint Elizabeth of Hungary, was written to demonstrate the wickedness of a system that persuaded a girl to practice asceticism within marriage.

Kingsley introduced into literature the huge British hero who always fought victoriously and who spread the doctrines of the English Church. He extolled the merits of massive unconscious goodness as exemplified by the scions of the English squires. "To read the Bible and kill Spaniards was the whole duty of the ideal Briton of Elizabeth's time, according to this authority."¹¹ With war he was fascinated. Accounts of the miles of hungry, wounded men in the Crimean War hardly roused him and, in conversation with Florence Nightingale, information concerning "missing stores" interested him very little. It was the unwounded soldiers that caught his imagination. In *Brave Words for Brave Soldiers* he wrote, "The Lord Jesus Christ is not only the Prince of Peace; He is the Prince of War too." As Kingsley grew older he wrote and did many things which encouraged jingoistic nationalism. Justin McCarthy claimed that he "out-Carlyled Carlyle in the worship of strong despotisms and force of any kind," and that "when two sides were possible to any question of human politics, he was sure to take the wrong one."¹² Una Pope-Hennessy stated that Kingsley's career "seems to have depended on spasms of sympathy, and not to have been determined by any process of intellectual development."¹³

There were many similarities between the originator of muscular Christianity and its other chief advocate, but there was one interesting difference. Whereas Kingsley disapproved of the label "muscular Christian," Thomas Hughes championed it just as he gloried in being called a "latitudinarian." In 1870 when Hughes was in the United States he chose to speak about muscular Christianity to the students at Harvard

University. Tom Brown, his most famous literary creation, was enrolled "in the brotherhood of muscular Christians," and Hughes commented:

As his biographer, I am not about to take exception to his enrollment; for, after considering the persons up and down her Majesty's dominions to whom the new nickname has been applied, the principles which they are supposed to hold, and the sort of lives they are supposed to lead, I cannot see where he could in these times have fallen into a nobler brotherhood.¹⁴

Dr. Thomas Arnold played an important role in shaping Hughes's distinctive interpretation of muscular Christianity. Although the Rugby headmaster, the man whom Richard C. Mack has called England's greatest educator, seems never to have shared Hughes's enthusiasm for athletics and is not to be identified altogether with the Doctor of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, he nevertheless did much to prepare Hughes for this particular movement.

Especially influential in this direction was Arnold's concept of "moral earnestness." An exponent of the gospel of work, he was constantly preoccupied with the great struggle between righteousness and evil. This struggle, Arnold held, extended to all events of life, because all individuals, especially boys under the age of thirteen, were fundamentally wicked. As an educator he saw it as his duty to instill in his students something of his own sense of "moral earnestness."

At Rugby, Arnold's influence upon the students may be classified under two categories. First of all there was his influence upon the intellectuals, the students who fully understood and sympathized with his major aims. Upon these boys Arnold exercised too much control. They came to rely too much upon a personality for whom there was no intermediate state between right and wrong. He put too much pressure upon them to develop both morally and intellectually, and he encouraged them to become men at too early an age. William Charles Lake, who admitted that his Rugby experience did him considerable harm, recorded his own reaction to Arnold's powerful personality.

Arnold said gravely: "Now, Lake, I know you can do well if you choose, and I shall expect you to do so." Those few words altered my whole character, intellectually at all events. Whatever I was, I was never an idle boy again, and my one wish was to be well thought of by Arnold.¹⁵

The result was that many of these cleverer boys experienced difficulties in their later years. When they were no longer under the shadow of their master, they suffered despair and skepticism. This is clearly seen in the poems of Arnold's son Matthew, as well as in the lives of others like Lake and Arthur Clough. In his later age, Clough wrote about "my strange distorted youth," and in his *Epilogue to Dipsychus* the elderly mentor protests against the extreme moral earnestness of the young. "They're al' too pious," he exclaims. "It's all Arnold's doing. He spoilt the public school."¹⁶

Although Arnold's influence may have been in some ways unsalu-

tary upon his more gifted students, this cannot be said of those "ordinary" boys with whom he was less intimate and who did not fully comprehend his moral and intellectual ideals. Lake was probably right when he expressed the opinion that it was the average boys who gained most as students at Rugby under Arnold and who benefited most from the example of Arnold in their adult years. Such were the majority of the students, those like the unknown author of *Recollections of Rugby*, and, above all, Thomas Hughes.

In his muscular Christianity, Hughes further developed Arnold's teaching that a moral struggle takes place at every point in life. Reviewing *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, *The Edinburgh Review* stated that only a graduate of Rugby could attach so much importance to the "merest trifles." The magazine added that the author found as many morals in a boxing match "as Mr. Ruskin does in the twist of a gargoyle's tail, or in the shape of a wallflower's root." On the other hand, Lord Elgin was of the opinion that it was Hughes's great achievement that he was able to convey the deep moral significance which seemingly petty school incidents possessed. This was one of the reasons why Elgin believed that the fight about which *The Edinburgh Review* jested, that between Tom Brown and Slogger Williams in Hughes's novel, would stand comparison with the celebrated fight between Hazlitt's Bill Neate and the gas-man.

Hughes remembered Arnold as "essentially a fighting man." Returning to speak to the students at Rugby about the school as it had been some fifty years earlier when he had been a student there under Arnold, Hughes said that he and his fellow-students had been trained for the "fight to which we had all been pledged at our baptism." Indeed, they had the feeling that they already were participating in a fight between good and evil, between Christ and the Devil, a fight that required all their physical, intellectual and moral powers.

Especially repugnant to Hughes was the belief held by some that Christianity was no faith for fighters, "for men who have to do the roughest and hardest work in the world." One of the most common objections made against the Gospel, said Hughes, was that it was not suitable for such men. To the contrary, urged the man who had been Colonel of the Volunteer Bloomsbury Rifles, Christians were under the obligation to fight with their bodies, minds and spirits against whatever was false, and therefore Christ could "call them as plainly in the beating of a drum to battle as in the bell calling to prayer." The greatest fighting in history had been done by those who believed that they were fighting under the leadership and with the help of God. He admitted that war was evil and stated that Christians should have nothing to do with it unless "it is the clear path of supreme duty," but a battlefield

could be "one of the very noblest places from which a true man may make a bee-line track to heaven."

Tom Hughes had a natural love for pugilism, and as boxing coach at the Working Men's College, the school founded by himself and other Christian Socialists in London, he formulated moral and intellectual values for that sport. "To knock someone down, and *post hoc*, almost *propter hoc*—to be a good fellow and a Christian ever afterwards," was the creed of muscular Christianity, according to Vernon Rendall. Hughes's advice about fighting that is found at the close of the chapter entitled "The Fight" in *Tom Brown's Schooldays* is worth recording:

As to fighting, keep out of it if you can, by all means. When the time comes, if it ever should, that you have to say "Yes" or "No" to a challenge to fight, say "No" if you can—only take care you make it clear to yourselves why you say "No." It's a proof of the highest courage, if done from true Christian motives. It's quite right and justifiable, if done from a simple aversion to physical pain and danger. But don't say "No" because you fear a licking, and say or think it's because you fear God, for that's neither Christian nor honest. And if you do fight, fight it out; and don't give in while you can stand and see.¹⁷

According to Hughes, England's ancient games originally had been closely related to the Church. The Church had stimulated interest in these games through annual feasts of dedication to which each village sent its champion. Hughes had romantic boyhood memories of these "veasts" and seriously regretted their passing away. Their effect, he believed, had been on the whole "humanising and Christian." They had brought together all the people and had thus created better understanding among the classes. This understanding, said Hughes, would have continued to exist if the gentlefolk and farmers had not turned to other amusements and forgotten the poor. Class amusements, whether of the rich or poor, always ended up as "nuisances and curses to a country." The merit of such games as cricket and hunting was that they were "still more or less sociable and universal; there's a place for every man who will come and take his part."

Games also served the important function of strengthening the body. Since man was born with a body as well as a mind, Hughes stated, the body should be given just as careful treatment as the mind. Man's body was a God-given gift. Therefore, man would be judged by the way in which he took care of this gift. Since the body and the mind reacted upon one another, the man who exercised properly would be able to do far better mental work.

Like his muscular Christian friend Charles Kingsley, Hughes had no particular concern for intellectual aims. As a student at Oxford he demonstrated little concern about the revolution being brought about

by the Tractarians, and he was more interested in sports than in lectures. He himself did not have a very commanding intellect, and his sympathies were with the Squire in *Tom Brown's Schooldays* who did not send his son to school in order that he might learn Greek particles. In his famous book ethical purposes are achieved through organized games rather than through intellectual pursuits. Concerning a football match, Hughes wrote: "This is worth living for; the whole sum of school-boy existence gathered up into one straining, struggling half-hour worth a year of common life." Following the game, Old Brook tells the boys in the Schoolhouse: "I'd sooner win two Schoolhouse matches running than to get the Balliol scholarship any day." And near the end of the book, Tom Brown says to a young master, a game "is more than a game. It's an institution."

While he was never a nationalist in the sense that Kingsley was, Hughes did have his prejudices and admitted that he was something of a Philistine. On his first visit to the United States he told a sophisticated audience at the Music Hall in Boston, "I am before all things an Englishman—a John Bull if you will—loving Old England and feeling proud of her." As a young man writing to the girl to whom he was engaged concerning the nature of their married life, he suggested that the two occasionally would visit points in England but not travel abroad. "I don't like any foreign nation much from the little I know of them, and I am certainly a most thoroughly prejudiced John Bull." But despite remarks like these, Hughes actually travelled extensively and developed into a rather remarkable international statesman. During the American Civil War he played a major role in preventing war between his own country and the United States.

As a muscular Christian, Hughes is a more important figure than Kingsley because of Hughes's influence upon the development of secondary schools. Edward C. Mack and W. H. G. Armytage in their scholarly biography of Hughes say that "it is no exaggeration to say that *Tom Brown's Schooldays* made the modern public schools." Thomas Arnold brought about the reforms in the schools which made them congenial to the rising middle class in England, but the novel by Hughes "spread Arnold's fame abroad in a way that neither Arnold nor Stanley could spread it." And the schools that mushroomed after 1857 "tried to be as much as possible like the Rugby of Hughes's dream."¹⁸

But the Rugby of Hughes's book was not altogether like Arnold's Rugby. In *Tom Brown's Schooldays* Hughes emphasized certain aspects of Rugby life. And as early as 1858 *The Edinburgh Review* called attention to the fact that in the novel the author "viewed every part of

the subject through the medium of the doctrines of a school of which Mr. Kingsley is at once the ablest and the most popular teacher."¹⁹ This was particularly true of the picture presented of Dr. Arnold.

At the time when *Tom Brown's Schooldays* was being written the late Dr. Arnold was being accused of having turned his students into prigs. With this in mind, Hughes emphasized the human side of the Doctor and minimized the radical and awesome side of the headmaster. Arnold "has become a glorified boy scoutmaster whose strenuous spirituality has been made palatable to Englishmen by presenting it under the guise of the honest manliness of a Kingsley hero."²⁰ And instead of recognizing Arnold's great intellectual endeavour, the Doctor was portrayed as a sort of patron saint of games.

Thus the schools after 1857 tended to model themselves after the version described by Hughes rather than the real Rugby under Arnold. Athletics became stressed to a point that frightened even the author of *Tom Brown*. In order to gain popularity with the boys, the masters began to minimize intellectual responsibility. This process continued until and after Bertrand Russell's complaint:

Masters are selected largely for their athletic qualifications; they must conform, at least outwardly, to a whole code of behaviour, religious, political, social, and moral, which is intolerable to most intelligent people; they must encourage boys to be constantly occupied that they will have no time for sexual sin, and incidentally no time to think.²¹

Muscular Christianity also often resulted in further oversimplifications of the Christian faith. A later generation of muscular Christians would, like Bruce Barton, turn Christ into a supersalesman, and a still later generation would, like Norman Vincent Peale, convert God into a cosmic bellhop. And "self-reliance, under the pressure of preparation for the business world, tended to degenerate into the competitive spirit."²² The Young Men's Christian Association, another outgrowth of muscular Christianity, would in many areas become largely secularized.²³

But the results of muscular Christianity have not been all negative in character. It is difficult to overestimate the part this school of thought played in bringing about sanitary reform. At the time when Kingsley and Hughes were propagating their views there were countless people, educated and uneducated, who looked upon disease as the punishment of the Almighty upon sin. For these people, sanitary measures represented attempts to resist the decrees of Providence. But against such a perversion of religion, muscular Christianity calling for *mens sana in corpore sano* and closely allied with medical science was a powerful force. And it should be acknowledged that the physical education programs that have been developed in the schools, despite abuses, have not been without value.

But more important still has been the part that muscular Christianity has played in combating the weak pietism that so often masquerades as Christianity itself. John Henry Newman rightly reminded muscular Christians that our Lord "has substituted meekness for haughtiness, passiveness for violence, and innocence for craft,"²⁴ but Kingsley and Hughes were correct in their strenuous objections to any identification of Christianity with escape, sickness, or lack of courage. In this regard, many of those who are most contemptuous of this school are in some respects muscular Christians themselves.

1. Geoffrey Faber, *Jowett* (London: Faber and Faber, 1957), p. 316.
2. A. P. Stanley, "The Gorham Controversy," *The Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 92 (1850), p. 266.
3. W. J. Conybeare, "Church Parties," *The Edinburgh Review*, Vol. 98 (1853), p. 292.
4. Charles R. Sanders, *Coleridge and the Broad Church Movement* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1942), p. 91.
5. Principal John Tulloch made the interesting observation that "Mr. Maurice's great deficiency as a theologian is just his deficiency in certain critical qualities that belonged to Whately and others and gave a historic breadth to many of their conclusions." John Tulloch, *Movements of Religious Thought in Britain During the Nineteenth Century* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1885), p. 260. A dominant influence upon Maurice was the teaching of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen. The 1848-49 correspondence between Erskine and Samuel Brown reveals concern by these two men with the "I-Thou" conception. H. Howard Williams, "I and Thou," *The Expository Times*, Vol. LXIX No. 2. (November, 1957), pp. 50-52.
6. Una Pope-Hennessy, *Canon Charles Kingsley* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1948), p. 8.
7. "Kingsley's Miscellanies," *Saturday Review*, Vol. 8 (1859), p. 582.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 582.
9. "Charles Kingsley," *Macmillan's Magazine*, Vol. 31 (1875), p. 375.
10. Maurice B. Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple* (London: Faber and Faber, 1946), quoted on p. 219.
11. Justin McCarthy, *Reminiscences Vol. II* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1899), p. 251.
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 264, 625.
13. Una Pope-Hennessy, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
14. Thomas Hughes, *Tom Brown at Oxford* (London: Macmillan, 1874), p. 112.
15. Katharine Lake, *Memorials of William Charles Lake* (London: Edward Arnold, 1901), quoted on p. 8.
16. Harold Nicholson, *Good Behaviour* (London: Constable and Co., 1955), quoted on p. 257. The British "public school" is similar to the American private school.
17. Thomas Hughes, *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (London: Daily Sketch Publications, n.d.), p. 257.
18. Edward C. Mack and W. H. G. Armytage, *Thomas Hughes* (London: Ernest Benn, 1952), 100, 101.
19. "Tom Brown's Schooldays," *The Edinburgh Review*, Vol. CVII (1858), p. 176.
20. Edward C. Mack, *Public Schools and British Opinion* (London: Methuen and Co., 1938), pp. 80, 81.
21. Bertrand Russell, *Education and the Social Order* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1932), pp. 80, 81.
22. Edward C. Mack and W. H. G. Armytage, *Thomas Hughes, op. cit.*, p. 101.
23. Everet R. Johnson, "The Confusing 'C' in YMCA," *Christianity Today*, Vol. II, No. 14 (1958), pp. 5-8.
24. John Henry Newman, *History of My Religious Opinions* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865), p. 315.

METHODIST HISTORICAL STUDIES 1930-1959 (Part II)

FREDERICK A. NORWOOD, *Garrett Biblical Institute*

III. AMERICAN METHODISM

The traditional unconcern for historical roots in the Methodist Episcopal Church still prevails sufficiently to help account for a less extensive program of historical investigation than that reviewed above for Great Britain. The fact that England has a long-established Historical Society with a vigorous publishing program is indicative of the contrast. Organization for historical study in America is either dominated by the limited vision of Annual Conference groups or is so informal and peripheral as to lack central support. The Association of Methodist Historical Societies has been limited by many factors including dependence on Annual Conference organizations, a distracting marriage with the World Methodist Council, and lack of contact with research in universities and seminaries. An unofficial attempt to relate Wesley more directly to the life of American Methodism is seen in the development of the Wesley Society, which "wants to serve Methodism by a recall to our foundations." It combines the motives of historical research and Wesleyan evangelism. From beginnings in 1955 in New York and Indiana, several branch organizations have developed, devoted chiefly to holding meetings attended by some of those interested in the revival of the Wesleyan heritage in Methodism.

In spite of the disadvantages, however, much significant work has been forthcoming in the last three decades in the explication and interpretation of American Methodism. Of real worth is the new three-volume edition of *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*, edited by Elmer T. Clark, J. Manning Potts, and Jacob S. Payton.²³² A great deal of effort has gone into the preparation of these documents for a new edition, and much can be said for the fine maps and other aids. Unfortunately the effort has not always been matched by skill, and many errors have been noted, especially in the text of the letters. Although most of these are not such as to destroy the sense or impair general usefulness, the scholar is dismayed at the mistakes, omissions, additions, and alterations. The two volumes of the *Journal*, being a reprint of an earlier edition based on the original manuscript long since lost by fire, do not suffer in this respect, although inaccuracies in footnotes may be noted. This is not a final, definitive edition. Nevertheless, these three volumes may be greeted as a significant forward step in Asbury studies.

A. General

One of the dominant names in American church history is that of William Warren Sweet (see the article by Sidney Mead in *Church History*, XXII (1953), 33-70). Although the major concerns in this field have moved beyond his position, his work is of enduring value. This is especially true for Methodist history, in which Sweet did some of his earliest and best research, including excellent editions of and commentaries on the rare early Annual Conference journals in the Old West. Still standard and relatively up to date is *Methodism in American History*,²³³ which first appeared in 1933 and has recently been revised (1954). Even more important for basic research is the volume on Methodism in *Religion on the American Frontier* (IV),²³⁴ which contains parts of Whatcoat's, Lakin's, and Gilruth's journals, together with the Dromgoole letters and various miscellaneous documents. These are all indispensable sources for basic study. They stand as a reminder of the many other equally important sources that remain unpublished in any form, or survive in forlorn nineteenth century format naked of scholarly vesture. Here is another of the great unfinished tasks of history.

Francis Tees, pastor of old St. George's Church in Philadelphia, wrote a valuable story of *The Beginnings of Methodism in England and in America*,²³⁵ not annotated but based on original sources. A more or less miscellaneous collection of information, important and otherwise, on *Methodist Bishops* comes from the devoted pen of Frederick Leete, one of those bishops.²³⁶ As the author says, it consists of "personal notes and bibliography," including a one hundred page rag-bag of quotations from episcopal correspondence, followed by some sixty pages of quotations from unpublished writings in "arbitrary arrangement." The Leete collection at Southern Methodist University is in process of cataloguing.

At the present time a major enterprise is getting under way in the form of a definitive new three-volume history of American Methodism to be published by Abingdon Press. This work is intended to complement the forthcoming British history. In addition a *Dictionary of World Methodism* is being planned as a project of the Association of Methodist Historical Societies.

B. Special Aspects

An introduction to *The Organization of The Methodist Church* is provided by Nolan B. Harmon.²³⁷ Concentrating more fully on the background of development is Frederick A. Norwood, *Church Mem-*

bership in the Methodist Tradition, which begins with the English origins and traces the evolution into American Methodism.²³⁸ Francis Tees follows a similar procedure in *Methodist Origins*²³⁹ of societies, chapels, classes, the itineracy, etc.; but the treatment is not exhaustive. A dissertation that was accepted a year before the beginning point of this survey is "The Office of Bishop in The Methodist Church," by Robert W. Goodloe,²⁴⁰ and John Score is working at Duke University on the concept of the ministry, 1773-1865. A thesis in progress by Norman Spellmann concentrates on the theological and traditional backgrounds and early development of the Methodist episcopate. A book incorporating the addresses, on various aspects of the ministry in Methodism, delivered before the national Convocation of Methodist Theological Faculties in Nashville, 1959, by David Shipley, Frederick Norwood, Franz Hildebrandt *et al.*, will be published soon. One significant addition to the literature about the frontier is Elizabeth Nottingham's *Methodism and the Frontier: Indiana Proving Ground*.²⁴¹ This is especially valuable because the author limits her attention to a particular region, and thus is able to give an interpretation of greater depth. Too much of the study of frontier religion has been superficial and sensational.

Recent works dealing with various aspects of the problem of slavery, the Negro, and the Civil War, have thrown new light on the disastrous era. Ralph Morrow, in *Northern Methodism and Reconstruction*,²⁴² gives the story of northern Methodism in the South, discusses the problems of this southern expansion, and relates the religious history to political and social factors. Much attention is given to the Freedman's Aid Society. It is a serious, well documented study. The same author has "Northern Methodism in the South during Reconstruction" in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*.²⁴³ E. P. Southall writes on the "Attitude of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Toward the Negro from 1844 to 1870" in the *Journal of Negro History*.²⁴⁴ And J. Beverly Shaw deals with *The Negro in the History of Methodism* more generally.²⁴⁵ He follows the topic through the two main branches into the African Methodist Episcopal, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion, the Colored Methodist and other churches. An unpublished dissertation at Duke University by Frank Pool dealt with "The Southern Negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church."²⁴⁶ The reviewer has not seen this.

The most widely received book on American Methodist hymns is the semi-popular *Our Hymnody* by Robert McCutchan.²⁴⁷ In this book each hymn in the *Hymnal* is discussed in terms of its history. Relatively little is said on the musical aspects, although some famous hymn tunes, like Number 96, "Adeste Fidelis," receive fuller treatment. Musical

backgrounds are given in McCutchan's recent *Hymn Tune Names*.²⁴⁸ Several books by Benjamin Crawford deal with various aspects of hymns and Methodist belief.²⁴⁹

We have three major books on the subject of Methodist union, two of them from the pens of chief participants. The basic story is told by John M. Moore in *The Long Road to Methodist Union*.²⁵⁰ Bishop Moore was able to call upon the experiences of a long journey on that road. The whole period from 1844 to 1939 is covered; but most attention falls on the negotiations from 1876 on. A slant from the Methodist Protestant side, the side most easily ignored because of the relatively small size of the denomination, is given by James H. Straughn in *Inside Methodist Union*.²⁵¹ This is a noble attempt to put Methodist Protestants back in the story and has real value as source material provided by another of the main participants. The legal aspects of the tangled case are outlined by Walter McElreath in *Methodist Union in the Courts*.²⁵² Only a lawyer could have found his way through this historical maze. P. A. Carter opens a new facet in "Negro and Methodist Union" in *Church History*.²⁵³

Although no attempt is made in this article to survey in detail literature on groups divergent from the main line of Methodism, three books provide a useful, although obviously denominationalist, record of two such movements. For the Wesleyan Methodists we have Ira F. McLeister, *History of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America*.²⁵⁴ For the Free Methodists we have Carl L. Howland, *The Story of our Church*,²⁵⁵ and Richard R. Blews, *Master Workmen*,²⁵⁶ which consists of biographies of the bishops of that communion. One might mention, for the Nazarenes the dissertation by Donald Brickley, "The Life and Work of Phineas F. Bresee."²⁵⁷ One of the Negro branches is reported in David H. Bradley, *A History of the Methodist Episcopal Church Zion*, Part 1 ending with 1872.²⁵⁸

C. Autobiography and Biography

A modest book that tries to bring together some great personalities in Methodism in America is *Men of Zeal* by William W. Sweet.²⁵⁹ Not all of the volumes setting forth the heroes are equal in value and balance to this one. In fact, many works are of such ephemeral or purely personal value that they find no place in a serious bibliographical study. A number, however, are worthy of mention, either because they deal with figures of outstanding importance or because they are good historical studies in their own right. Curiously, Francis Asbury is one of the most neglected—except, of course, for the new edition of his works. The older biographies have little to commend them, and nothing new has appeared in these three decades. F. J. McConnell has an article on "Francis Asbury" in *RnL* in which he corrects some points and

states some problems.²⁶⁰ The same journal has "Barbara Heck, the 'Blue Church,' and Canadian Methodism."²⁶¹ A recent dissertation by Donald D. Douglass deals with "Psychological Aspects of the Pastoral Ministry of Francis Asbury."²⁶² One really substantial contribution is the dissertation by Robert Simpson, "Freeborn Garrettson, American Methodist Pioneer," available on microcard.²⁶³ This is a straight biography, based on the journal and other materials gathered in the Drew collection on Garrettson. A less adequate piece of work is the published *Life of Bishop Richard Whatcoat* by S. B. Bradley.²⁶⁴ But on Whatcoat beggars cannot be choosers. The book has many quotations from sources, but is not annotated and does not discuss sources. Elizabeth Connor is working on a biography, as yet unpublished, of Philip Gatch, based on his manuscript journal. Worth Tippy has brought out a good study on Robert R. Roberts in *Frontier Bishop*.²⁶⁵ He has done a competent job in putting together a life based on meager sources. A real help to those who cherish original materials is the *Calendar of the Ezekiel Cooper Collection of Early American Methodist Manuscripts* published by the government-sponsored Historical Records Commission in 1941.²⁶⁶ This calendar summarizes briefly the extensive collection of journals and letters preserved at Garrett Biblical Institute in Evanston. Robert D. Clark has written a fine *Life of Matthew Simpson*,²⁶⁷ in many ways a model of good biography. But then he has a fine subject in the person who combined pioneer spirit with advanced learning, Methodist devotion with political acumen. It is well annotated and well balanced. Another of the circuit riders, who did not in this case become a bishop, has been resuscitated, after a literary manner, in the *Autobiography of Peter Cartwright*, edited by Charles Wallis.²⁶⁸ No one will deny that this famous story deserves renewed attention. But one may regret that the reprinting did not provide occasion for a serious work of editing. The newest biography is that of Jesse Walker by Almer Pennewell.²⁶⁹

Farther west is the locale of William Ward's *Pioneering in the Great West*,²⁷⁰ an autobiography of chiefly local and personal interest. More significant historically is the study of *Jason Lee* by Cornelius Brosnan.²⁷¹ This full-dress biography is the work of a professional historian, and shows it in notes and bibliography.

Many more recent autobiographies have been forthcoming. Perhaps it will suffice to list Francis J. McConnell, *By the Way*,²⁷² providing prime source material in fascinating style for recent history; James Cannon, *Bishop Cannon's Own Story*,²⁷³ which is just that; Frederick Leete, *Adventures of a Travelling Preacher*,²⁷⁴ which is the attempt of a bishop to recall a long ministry framed in the ornate scrolls of family pride; the interesting autobiographical testimony of *A Min-*

ister on the Tennessee Valley, by Isaac P. Martin,²⁷⁵ and the autobiography of Richard Allen. Towering figures from southern Methodism have found recent biographers: Bishop McTyeire in John J. Tigert,²⁷⁶ and Bishop Candler in Alfred M. Pierce.²⁷⁷

Observing the indifferent character of some modern publications and the poorly clothed mass of nineteenth century works, one should emphasize a continuing need for modern annotated editions of valuable journals and autobiographies, on the basis of which new and more meaningful lives might be written in the future.

D. Theology

Several important pieces of research have been produced by young scholars in the form of doctoral dissertations. These works serve to throw new light on the theological orientation of American Methodism. It is no longer possible to assume that Methodism *had* no theological orientation. The most comprehensive work is that of Leland Scott, "Methodist Theology in America in the Nineteenth Century," a dissertation available on microcard.²⁷⁸ He finds that one main contribution was the emphasis on the gracious foundations of moral freedom. He finds both theological conservatism and an awareness of the new scientific thought. He has separate chapters on Daniel Whedon, W. F. Warren, Miner Raymond ("American Methodism's representative theologian"), Thomas Summers, and John Miley. Some of this material is available in more accessible form in "Methodist Theology in America in the Nineteenth Century" in *RnL*.²⁷⁹ The article on the same subject by David Shipley in the July, 1959 *LQHR*, should be noted. At Yale University William McCutcheon is finishing work on a doctoral dissertation dealing with the impact of neo-orthodoxy on American Methodist theology in the 1920's and 1930's.^{279a} And John Score at Duke University is working on a dissertation analyzing the concept of the ministry in Methodism down to 1865. John L. Peters does an excellent piece of work in *Christian Perfection and American Methodism*.²⁸⁰ Almost half of this work deals with the English grounds in Wesley's theology. He would distinguish clearly between Methodist perfection and "sectarian puritanism" in America, and bewails the failure to distinguish between Christian perfection (as a process) and entire sanctification (as an immediate experience). Although the doctrine was nearly drowned on the frontier, a revival incorporating aspects of the doctrine developed in the 1840's, but soon became sterile and stereotyped. An older unpublished dissertation is that by Claude H. Thompson.²⁸¹ Robert Chiles takes a long view in "Methodist Apostasy: From Free Grace to Free Will" in *RnL*,²⁸² all the way from Wesley to Knudson. Midway between these last two extremes is the subject of the disserta-

tion by Howard E. Hunter: "William Fairfield Warren: Methodist Theologian."²⁸³ This is an "intellectual biography" of the nineteenth century president of Boston University and dean of the School of Religion. Two unpublished dissertations from Duke University deal with Wilbur Fisk Tillett and Francis J. McConnell.²⁸⁴

"The Sacraments in Early American Methodism" is the subject of an informative article by Paul S. Sanders in *Church History*.²⁸⁵ The main force of his argument is that Wesley combined evangelicalism and sacramentalism and that some of both was lost in the American scene. His material is based on the dissertation listed above on the fate of Wesley's sacramentalism in early America.²⁸⁶ A different viewpoint, couched in terms of liberal American Methodism, is found in Robert W. Goodloe, *The Sacraments in Methodism*.²⁸⁷ Historical interest and contemporary trends in Methodist worship are reflected in *The Versicle*, periodical of the Order of St. Luke, an unofficial American Methodist society devoted to these concerns. It may be compared with the British *Bulletin of the Methodist Sacramental Fellowship*. Other references, which cover both English and American aspects, may be found in the appropriate section under English Methodism above.

E. Social and Political

One of the more ambitious projects of publication supported by one of the boards of The Methodist Church is that seeking to define the Methodist history and position on social questions. A four-volume series is projected by the Board of Social and Economic Relations and being developed by several members of the faculty of Boston University School of Theology on the theology, the history, the situation, and the prospects in this large area. It promises to provide a panoramic picture of Methodist social thought and attitudes. The first volume carries the story to 1908.

An older book of real value is Hunter Farish, *The Circuit Rider Dismounts: A Social History of Southern Methodism, 1865-1900*.²⁸⁸ This revision of a dissertation describes the influence of the southern branch on social problems, from a southern point of view. Glenn Massengale has an unpublished dissertation on "Collegiate Education in the Methodist Church, South, 1902-1939,"²⁸⁹ which reports on one hundred ten schools related to the church, and measures the standards maintained and improved over the years. Another dissertation, available on microcard, is Joseph Allen, "The Methodist Board of Temperance as an Instrument of Church Policy."²⁹⁰ This piece of research is much more significant than its title might suggest, and represents a basic analysis of polity and social attitude. A broader canvas of more

recent times is surveyed by Robert M. Miller in "The Social Attitudes of American Methodists, 1919-1929," in *RnL*.²⁹¹ It is based on doctoral research. An unpublished dissertation by Arnold O. Olson is entitled "The Social Attitudes and Social Action of Some Ministers of the New York Conference of The Methodist Church."²⁹² The writer has not seen this thesis.

Certain works relating social issues to the Negro have been listed under special aspects.

F. *Regional*

Most regional history in American Methodism is done on the basis of boundaries of annual conferences. There have appeared recently, however, two notable works related to a larger regional unit. They are George Baker, *An Introduction to the History of Early New England Methodism*,²⁹³ and William Duren, *The Trail of the Circuit Rider*.²⁹⁴ The former, which consists of a short essay fastened to a fifty-page bibliography, covers the period from 1789 to 1839 with attention to the development of circuits, attitudes to social questions, and relation to the theme of disestablishment. The latter includes Methodism in general to 1844 and southern Methodism from 1844 on. The author, who was editor of the *New Orleans Christian Advocate*, tries to be objective on the subject of slavery, and offers the first serious study on southern Methodism since the work of McTyeire in 1884.

By far the most typical form of Methodist regional and local history is the history of the annual conference. One finds all forms, ranging from the miscellany of local items to the scholarly intensive study. In general three major types may be discerned among those which have appeared since 1930. First are the few historical studies of high quality and integrity, relatively free from forces of local pride, conference boasting, and name naming. Second are the numerous exhaustive and exhausting narrowly chronological works, following a weary pattern of either year by year progression of annual conferences or a sequence of quadrennia. The third category comprises those works that through an episodal technique seek to dramatize the "story." Many of these are little better than miscellanies of elderly reminiscences. They do perform the service of preserving much information and source material otherwise too easily lost; but they do not qualify as serious historical works. The Association of Methodist Historical Societies could make a real contribution by setting up guiding standards for the preparation of histories of annual conferences. In this way some degree of uniformity and reliability could be achieved.

Taking the recent publications roughly in geographical order from

east to west, one of the newest is the *Newark Conference Centennial History*, edited by Vernon Hampton and written by—so it seems—half the membership of the Conference.²⁹⁵ This cooperative work suffers badly from the disjointed appearance that is congenital to such efforts. But it is full of useful information which, if it is not history, is good grist for history. *The Onward Way, the Story of the New York Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*²⁹⁶ was not seen by the reviewer. The Peninsula Conference of the eastern seaboard has its record in *The Garden of Methodism* by Ernest C. Hallman,²⁹⁷ one of the detailed encyclopedic attempts. Another Conference history planned is one for the New Jersey Conference.

Excellent in every way is *Virginia Methodism* by William W. Sweet.²⁹⁸ The author enjoyed the advantages of an important region providing a natural unit for development of themes basic for all later Methodism and a freedom of expression unusual in conference histories. An example of the chronological pattern is Albert D. Betts, *History of South Carolina Methodism*.²⁹⁹ In addition to being disjointed, without any unifying theme, much given to adulation of the "saints," the book suffers from amateur printing technique. Another chronological history, but more broadly conceived, is Alfred Pierce, *A History of Methodism in Georgia*, covering the whole period from 1736 to 1955.³⁰⁰ The author felt impelled to apologize in the Foreword for not naming all the members of Conference and all the churches. Partially annotated, this history has a relatively broad perspective and coherence. Charles T. Thrift's *The Trail of the Florida Circuit Rider*³⁰¹ tells the story in middle and east Florida (Florida Conference), is briefly annotated, and concentrates on the nineteenth century. A new history of Alabama Methodism by M. E. Lazenby and Franklin S. Moseley is in process of publication. Two volumes, both published under the auspices of the Hawkins Foundation, record Mississippi Methodist history: John B. Cain, *Methodism in the Mississippi Conference, 1846-1870*,³⁰² which is a sequel to the older two volume history that deals with the earlier period, and William B. Jones, *Methodism in the Mississippi Conference*,³⁰³ which runs down to the year 1894. These are both records of sessions of annual conferences.

A well organized study of an important and in some ways unique region is Isaac Martin, *Methodism in Holston*.³⁰⁴ It brings up to date the older work of R. N. Price. Another important history, unfortunately dependent on an artificial pattern of quadrennia, is William E. Arnold, *A History of Methodism in Kentucky*.³⁰⁵ The two volumes bring the record down only to 1846. Cullen Carter writes a *History of the Tennessee Conference*³⁰⁶ in the same chronological pattern. A more specialized work is Walter Posey, *The Development of Methodism in the Old*

Southwest,³⁰⁷ which goes to 1824, and, although regional, is superior to most conference-style histories.

One of the finest definitions of regional history is Wallace Smeltzer's *Methodism on the Headwaters of the Ohio*,³⁰⁸ being the history of the Pittsburgh Conference cast in the proper historical setting. Here was one of the crucial areas for the development of Methodism in the Old West, and Smeltzer has produced a fine history, basic for study of all Methodism in the Northwest Territory, as well as in the entire Ohio River valley. Three good histories have appeared covering the three conferences of Indiana. They are Herbert Heller, *Indiana Conference of the Methodist Church, 1832-1956*,³⁰⁹ centering mainly in the southern part of the state; Frederick A. Norwood, *History of the North Indiana Conference, 1917-1956*,³¹⁰ which in spite of the title begins with the turn of the century, and constitutes a sequel to the earlier *History of the North Indiana Conference* by Robert Herrick and W. W. Sweet, now reprinted;³¹¹ and Jack Detzler, *The History of the Northwest Indiana Conference of The Methodist Church, 1852-1951*.³¹² Farther north range the interests of William Prescott, *The Fathers Still Speak, a History of Michigan Methodism*,³¹³ a brief survey with a full bibliography. There exists also a popularly written *History of Methodism in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan*.³¹⁴ Elizabeth Wilson writes on the Wisconsin Conference in *Methodism in Eastern Wisconsin*,³¹⁵ which covers the period 1832-1850. And Charles Pace is author and editor of *Our Fathers Built, a Century of Minnesota Methodism*.³¹⁶ Without annotations, this book consists of a compilation of articles on diverse topics.

Farther west, beyond the Mississippi, Everett Jackman carries on *The Nebraska Methodist Story*,³¹⁷ an "official" history of the century 1854-1954. This book is organized topically according to "Conference interests." A. Sterling Ward is writing a history of Missouri Methodism. A newer contribution is Olin W. Nail's *The First One Hundred Years of the Southwest Texas Conference of The Methodist Church, 1858-1958*.³¹⁸ Another of the anecdotal types is Edward L. Mills, *Plains, Peaks and Pioneers*,³¹⁹ on Montana Conference. Finally, a book that tries too desperately to be as colorful as its subject is L. L. Loofbourow, *In Search of God's Gold*,³²⁰ on California. It is more satisfactorily organized than most conference histories, but overdoes the light touch.

No attempt has been made in this survey to deal with purely local works. Because they cover larger areas, however, which are not truly annual conferences, the following are listed: Cullen Carter, *History of Methodist Churches and Institutions in Middle Tennessee, 1787-1956*³²¹; Henry Hawkins, *Methodism in Natches*³²²; and Henry Merkel, *History of Methodism in Utah*.³²³

A survey of Methodist local history on the basis of annual conferences reveals a sad lack of historical method, procedure, and insight. Conference funds of the future ought to be directed toward the development of a higher grade of historical writing than the customary provincial viewing with pride and determined encyclopedism.

IV. WORLD METHODISM

The recent literature on historical aspects of Methodism around the world, especially outside Europe and America, is characterized by a very few basic works—one of them monumental—, a few scattered regional studies, and a large number of brief, popular promotional types. One might emphasize at the outset that the field of missions is in ferment, as indicated by the study conference sponsored by the American Methodist Board of Missions at Glen Lake in 1958. In the field of missions if anywhere the impact of theological rethinking bears direct weight on the writing and interpretation of history.

A sort of almanac of statistics is *The World Methodist Movement*, edited by Ivan Lee Holt and Elmer Clark.³²⁴ It gives statistics of membership and surveys conditions. For the outreach of English Methodist missions there is Cyril J. Davey, *The March of Methodism; The Story of Methodist Missionary Work Overseas*.³²⁵ It is popular in character, and divides the subject into three periods: 1786-1820, 1820-1900, and 1900-1950. By far the most impressive as well as the most valuable work is the *History of Methodist Missions* by Wade C. Barclay,³²⁶ of which three volumes of a projected six are complete to date. The first two deal with the period 1769 to 1844. Volume III is concerned with the Methodist Episcopal Church between 1845 and 1895. Volume IV, not yet published, brings this branch down to 1939. Other volumes will cover the southern branch, the Methodist Protestants, and recent developments. One is greatly impressed with the scale and quality of scholarship revealed in the voluminous footnotes and bibliography, as well as in the careful and systematic organization of material and the broad perspective in which the wealth of detail is always observed and interpreted. Dr. Barclay and the research staff of the Board of Missions have made possible a truly monumental contribution to the literature of the Christian world mission.

For Europe a good book is Paul Douglass' *The Story of German Methodism*.³²⁷ The curious interaction of Europe and America is effectively delineated. Two German works deal with the same area. One is August Rücker, *Die Pioniere des Methodismus in Deutschland*,³²⁸ and the other is J. W. Ernst Sommer, *Christoph Gottlob Müller von Winnenden*,³²⁹ the founder of Wesleyan Methodism in Germany.

Aside from Barclay and the numerous semi-historical publications of the missions boards there is not much available on the Western Hemisphere. A document that might easily be overlooked is edited by R. M. Gatke: "A Document of Mission History, 1833-43 . . ." in the *Oregon Historical Quarterly*.³³⁰ Frederick Pilkington has written, from the viewpoint of British Methodism, on *Daybreak in Jamaica*,³³¹ a popular work.

Two relatively good historical surveys deal with two major areas in the continent of Asia. One is Walter Lacy, *A Hundred Years of China Methodism*,³³² published in 1948 and thus not definitive on revolutionary changes of the last few years. The other is John N. Hollister, *The Centenary of The Methodist Church in Southern Asia*.³³³ This is serious history, well annotated. A more popular survey, but quite effective, is James K. Mathews, *South of the Himalayas*.³³⁴

For Africa there are two publications of the English Cargate Press: Clarence Thorpe, *Limpopo to Zambesi; Sixty Years of Methodism in Southern Rhodesia*³³⁵; and Harry Belshaw, *Facing the Future in West Africa*,³³⁶ which is not strictly historical.

Historical study in missions stands in need of careful, definitive investigations of particular regions. These should be developed in connection with the fundamental reorientation of the entire missionary enterprise in these latter days.

Discussion of another facet of modern world Methodism, recent ecumenical activity, is not attempted in this survey.

ADDENDUM. For clarification it should be noted that the expectation expressed on page 396 of Part I regarding the publication of Martin Schmidt's work has not yet been realized: the German second volume and the English translation of the first volume (by Epworth Press) are still in progress. The following titles should be added for Part I: Maldwyn Edwards, *The Astonishing Youth* (London, Epworth Press, 1959, 128 p.) an attempt to characterize Wesley the man; A. Raymond George, "Ordination in Methodism," *LQHR*, 176 (1951), 156-69; H. Watkin-Jones, *Methodist Churchmanship and Its Implications* (London, Epworth Press, 1946, 54 p.). Colin Williams' thesis is now published in revised form as *The Theology of John Wesley* (Abingdon, 1960). Albert Outler is editing selected works of Wesley for a forthcoming series of Protestant source materials.

III. AMERICAN METHODISM

A. General

232. Asbury, Francis. *The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*. London: Epworth Press; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958, 3 vols. Ed. by Elmer T. Clark, J. Manning Potts, and Jacob S. Payton.
233. Sweet, William Warren. *Methodism in American History*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954, 472 p.

234. Sweet, William Warren. *Religion on the American Frontier, 1783-1840*. Vol. IV: *The Methodists*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946, 800 p.
235. Tees, Francis H. *The Beginnings of Methodism in England and in America*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1940, 255 p.
236. Leete, Frederiek De Land. *Methodist Bishops*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1948, 457 p.

B. Special Aspects

237. Harmon, N. B. *The Organization of The Methodist Church*. Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1953, 288 p.
238. Cf. note 161.
239. Tees, Francis H. *Methodist Origins*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1948, 223 p.
240. Goodloe, Robert W. "The Office of Bishop in The Methodist Church" Chicago: University of Chicago, 1929. Dissertation.
241. Nottingham, Elizabeth K. *Methodism and the Frontier; Indiana Proving Ground*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941, 231 p.
242. Morrow, Ralph E. *Northern Methodism and Reconstruction*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1956, 269 p.
243. Morrow, Ralph E. "Northern Methodism in the South During Reconstruction" *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLI (1954), 197-218.
244. Southall, E. P. "Attitude of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Toward the Negro from 1844 to 1870" *Journal of Negro History*, XVI (1931), 359-70.
245. Shaw, J. Beverly F. *The Negro in the History of Methodism*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1954, 234 p.
246. Pool, Frank K. "The Southern Negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church" Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1939. Dissertation.
247. McCutchan, Robert G. *Our Hymnody*. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1937, 619 p.
248. McCutchan, Robert G. *Hymn Tune Names*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957, 206 p.
249. Crawford, Benjamin F. *Changing Concepts of Religion*. Carnegie, Pennsylvania: Carnegie Church Press, 1939, 245 p. The same book appears under the title, *Religious Trends in a Century of Hymns*, 1938. Other titles are: *Theological Trends*, 1939; and *Our Methodist Hymnody*, 1940, all published by Carnegie.
250. Moore, John M. *The Long Road to Methodist Union*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943, 247 p.
251. Straughn, James H. *Inside Methodist Union*. Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1958, 192 p.
252. McElreath, Walter. *Methodist Union in the Courts*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946, 318 p.
253. Carter, P. A. "Negro and Methodist Union" *Church History*, XXI (1952), 55-70.
254. McLeister, Ira F. *History of the Wesleyan Methodist Church of America*. Syracuse, New York: Wesleyan Methodist Publishing Association, 1934, 347 p.
255. Howland, Carl L. *The Story of Our Church*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Free Methodist Publishing House, 1951, 172 p.
256. Blews, Richard R. *Master Workmen*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Light and Life Press, 1939, 393 p.
257. Brickley, Donald P. "The Life and Work of Phineas F. Bresee" Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1957, 244 p. University Microfilms. Dissertation.
258. Bradley, David H. *A History of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, 1796-1872*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, Part I, 1956.

C. Autobiography and Biography

259. Sweet, William W. *Men of Zeal*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1935, 208 p.
260. McConnell, Francis J. "Francis Asbury" *RnL*, XV (1945-46), 23-36.
261. King, George B. "Barbara Heck, the 'Blue Church' and Canadian Methodism" *RnL*, XXII (1952-53), 134-41.
262. Douglass, Donald D. "Psychological Aspects of the Pastoral Ministry of Francis Asbury" Boston: Boston University, 1957, 218 p. University Microfilms. Dissertation.
263. Simpson, Robert D. "Freeborn Garrettson, American Methodist Pioneer" Madison, New Jersey: Drew University, 1954. Madison, Wisconsin: Microcard Foundation, 1954. Dissertation.
264. Bradley, S. B. *The Life of Bishop Richard Whatcoat*. Louisville: Pentecostal Publishing Company, 1936, 198 p.
265. Tippy, Worth M. *Frontier Bishop*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958, 207 p.
266. Cooper, Ezekiel. *Calendar of the Ezekiel Cooper Collection of Early American Methodist Manuscripts*. Chicago: Historical Records Survey, 1941, 97 p.
267. Clark, Robert D. *The Life of Matthew Simpson*. New York: Macmillan, 1956, 344 p.
268. Cartwright, Peter. *Autobiography of Peter Cartwright*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, 349 p. Edited by Charles L. Wallis.
269. Pennewell, Almer. *A Voice in the Wilderness, Jesse Walker*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1959, 191 p.
270. Ward, William T. *Pioneering in the Great West*. Winfield, Kansas: 1952, 86 p.
271. Brosnan, Cornelius J. *Jason Lee*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932, 348 p.
272. McConnell, Francis J. *By the Way*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952, 286 p.
273. Cannon, James. *Bishop Cannon's Own Story*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1955, xxxi, 465 p. Edited by Richard L. Watson, Jr.

274. Leete, Frederick. *Adventures of a Travelling Preacher*. Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1952, 154 p.
 275. Martin, Isaac P. *A Minister in the Tennessee Valley*. . . . Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1954, 234 p. *The Life Experience and Gospel Labors of the Rt. Rev. Richard Allen*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960, 93 p. A reissue.
 276. Tigert, John J. *Bishop Holland Nimmans McTyeire, Ecclesiastical and Educational Architect*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1955, 279 p.
 277. Pierce, Alfred M. *Giant Against the Sky*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948, 270 p.
- D. Theology
278. Scott, Leland H. "Methodist Theology in America in the Nineteenth Century" New Haven: Yale University, 1954. Madison: Microcard Foundation, 1955. Dissertation.
 279. Scott, Leland H. "Methodist Theology in America in the Nineteenth Century" *RnL*, XXV (1955-56), 87-98.
 - 279a. "The Theology of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1919-1939."
 280. Peters, John L. *Christian Perfection and American Methodism*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956, 252 p.
 281. Thompson, Claude H. "The Witness of American Methodism to the Historical Doctrine of Christian Perfection" Madison, New Jersey: Drew University, 1949. Dissertation.
 282. Chiles, Robert E. "Methodist Apostasy: From Free Grace to Free Will" *RnL*, XXVII (1957-58), 438-49.
 283. Hunter, Howard E. "William Fairfield Warren: Methodist Theologian" Boston: Boston University, 1957, 355 p. University Microfilms. Dissertation.
 284. Colloms, Lester H. "Wilbur Fisk Tillett: Theologian and Educator" Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1942. Dissertation. Benjamin, William W. "The Christian Ethical Theory of Bishop Francis J. McConnell." Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1957. Dissertation.
 285. Saunders, Paul S. "The Sacraments in Early American Methodism" *Church History*, XXVI (1957), 355-71.
 286. See note 201.
 287. Goodloe, Robert W. *The Sacraments in Methodism*. New York: The Methodist Publishing House, 1953, 160 p.
- E. Social and Political
288. Farish, Hunter D. *The Circuit Rider Dismounts, A Social History of Southern Methodism, 1865-1900*. Richmond, Virginia: The Dietz Press, 1938, 400 p.
 289. Massengale, Glenn. "Collegiate Education in the Methodist Church, South, 1902-1939" New Haven: Yale University, 1950. Dissertation.
 290. Allen, Joseph L. "The Methodist Board of Temperance as an Instrument of Church Policy" Madison: Microcard Foundation, 1957.
 291. Miller, Robert M. "The Social Attitudes of American Methodists, 1919-1929" *RnL*, XXVII (1957-58), 185-98.
 292. Olson, Arnold O. "The Social Attitudes and Social Action of Some Ministers of the New York Conference of the Methodist Church" New Haven: Yale University, 1953. Dissertation.
- F. Regional
293. Baker, George C. *An Introduction to the History of Early New England Methodism, 1789-1839*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1941, 145 p.
 294. Duren, William L. *The Trail of the Circuit Rider*. New Orleans: Chalmers' Printing House, 1936, 425 p.
 295. Hampton, Vernon B. (ed.) *Newark Conference Centennial History, 1857-1957*. N.p., Historical Society of the Newark Conference, 1957, 586 p.
 296. *The Onward Way, The Story of the New York Annual Conference of the Methodist Church*.
 297. Hallman, Ernest C. *The Garden of Methodism*. N.p., 1948, 453 p.
 298. Sweet, William W. *Virginia Methodism*. Richmond: Whittet and Shepper-son, 1955, 427 p.
 299. Betts, Albert D. *History of South Carolina Methodism*. Columbia, South Carolina: Advocate Press, 1952, 544 p.
 300. Pierce, Alfred M. *A History of Methodism in Georgia*. Atlanta: North Georgia Conference Historical Society, 1956, 345 p.
 301. Thrift, Charles T. *The Trail of the Florida Circuit Rider*. Lakeland, Florida: Florida Southern College Press, 1944, 168 p.
 302. Cain, John B. *Methodism in the Mississippi Conference, 1846-1870*. Jackson, Mississippi: The Hawkins Foundation, 1939, xx, 519 p.
 303. Jones, William B. *Methodism in the Mississippi Conference*. Jackson, Mississippi: Mississippi Conference Historical Society, 1951, 508 p.
 304. Martin, Isaac P. *Methodism in Holston*. Knoxville: Methodist Historical Society of Holston Conference, 1945, 459 p.
 305. Arnold, William E. *A History of Methodism in Kentucky*. Louisville: The Herald Press, 1935-36, 2 vols.
 306. Carter, Cullen T. *History of The Tennessee Conference*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1948, 556 p.
 307. Posey, Walter B. *The Development of Methodism in the Old Southwest*. Tuskaaloosa, Alabama: Weatherford Printing Company, 1933.

308. Smeltzer, Wallace G. *Methodism on the Headwaters of the Ohio*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1951, 448 p.
309. Heller, Herbert L. *Indiana Conference of the Methodist Church, 1852-1956*. N.p., 1956, 452 p.
310. Norwood, Frederick A. *History of the North Indiana Conference, 1917-1956*. Winona Lake, Indiana: North Indiana Conference Historical Society, 1957, 331 p.
311. Herrick, Robert, and W. W. Sweet. *History of the North Indiana Conference*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Light and Life Press, 1958.
312. Detzler, Jack J. *The History of the Northwest Indiana Conference of the Methodist Church, 1852-1951*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1953, 200 p.
313. Prescott, William R. *The Fathers Still Speak, A History of Michigan Methodism*. Lansing: Michigan Printing Service, 1941, 144 p.
314. *History of Methodism in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan*. Adrian, Michigan: 1955, 37 p.
315. Wilson, Elizabeth. *Methodism in Eastern Wisconsin*. Milwaukee: Wisconsin Conference Historical Society, 1938, 90 p.
316. Pace, Charles N. *Our Fathers Built, a Century of Minnesota Methodism*. N.p., Historical Society of Minnesota Conference, 1952, 254 p.
317. Jackman, Everett E. *The Nebraska Methodist Story*. Wymore, Nebraska: Nebraska Conference Methodist Historical Society, 1954, 238 p.
318. Nail, Olin W. *The First One Hundred Years of the Southwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Church, 1858-1958*. San Antonio: 1958, 248 p.
319. Mills, Edward L. *Plains, Peaks and Pioneers*. Portland, Oregon: Binford and Mort, 1947, 244 p.
320. Loofbourow, Leonidas L. *In Search of God's Gold*. . . . San Francisco: Historical Society of California-Nevada Annual Conference, 1950, 313 p.
321. Carter, Cullen T. *History of Methodist Churches and Institutions in Middle Tennessee, 1786-1956*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1956, 443 p.
322. Hawkins, Henry G. *Methodism in Natchez*. Jackson, Mississippi: The Hawkins Foundation, 1937, 222 p.
323. Merkel, Henry M. *History of Methodism in Utah*. Colorado Springs: Denton Printing Company, 1938, 269 p.

IV. WORLD METHODISM

324. Holt, Ivan Lee, and E. T. Clark. *The World Methodist Movement*. Nashville: Upper Room Press, 1956, 148 p.
325. Davey, Cyril J. *The March of Methodism; the Story of Methodist Missionary Work Overseas*. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951, 209 p. (Printed in Britain).
326. Barclay, Wade Crawford. *History of Methodist Missions*. Part One: Early American Methodism 1769-1844. Vol. I: Missionary Motivation and Expansion, 1949. Vol II: To Reform the Nation, 1950. Part Two: The Methodist Episcopal Church, 1845-1939. Vol. III: Widening Horizons, 1845-95, 1957. New York: Board of Missions.
327. Douglass, Paul F. *The Story of German Methodism*. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1939, 297, 64 p. New: Friedlich Wunderlich, *Methodists Linking Two Continents*. Nashville: Methodist Publishing House, 1960, 143 p.
328. Rücker, August. *Die Pioniere des Methodismus in Deutschland*. Bremen: 1934 ff., 2 vols.
329. Sommer, J. W. Ernst. *Christoph Gottlob Müller von Winnenden*. Bremen: 1933, 94 p.
330. Gatke, R. M. "A Document of Mission History, 1833-43. . . ." *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XXXVI (1935), 71-94, 163-81.
331. Pilkington, Frederick. *Daybreak in Jamaica*. London: Epworth press, 1950, 220 p.
332. Lacy, Walter N. *A Hundred Years of China Methodism*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948, 335 p.
333. Hollister, John N. *The Centenary of the Methodist Church in Southern Asia*. Lucknow: Lucknow Publishing House, 1956, xxxi, 414 p.
334. Mathews, James K. *South of the Himalayas*. . . . New York: Board of Missions, 1955, 155 p.
335. Thorpe, Clarence. *Limpopo to Zambesi; Sixty Years of Methodism in Southern Rhodesia*. London: Cargate Press, 1951, 127 p.
336. Belshaw, Harry. *Facing the Future in West Africa*. London: Cargate Press, 1951, 218 p.

COMMUNICATION

The Editors,

CHURCH HISTORY

The long communication of Donald K. Gorrell commenting on my article "Christian Missions to the Indians of Oregon" gives me the pleasure of knowing he, at least, has read the article and was, to a certain extent, appreciative of what I was trying to do.

However, I think that a number of his criticisms are somewhat picayune. He states that there are in my article "at least two errors of fact." For the first he cites the date, 1834, as the year that Jason Lee secured an appropriation of forty thousand dollars. A glance will show that this is in a context which indicates it is some years later than the date 1834 used in a previous paragraph. It is quite obviously a misprint. Whether the error was in typing or in printing I cannot check as I no longer have a copy of my original manuscript. In no way does this affect my presentation.

His second cited error is that I "concluded that all Protestant missions to Oregon ended with the Whitman massacre," and he goes on to cite evidence for the continuance of missions to the white settlers. I did not think it necessary to add the phrase "to the Indians" every time as Indian missions was my subject. It seems to me to be stretching a point to interpret my words as indicating that missions to whites were closed.

I believe that Mr. Gorrell has a valid criticism of the title given to my article. As a matter of fact it bore a longer and more descriptive title at first, but it got shortened along the way. Actually, the article was written as a 45 minute address to a group of schoolteachers in Seattle. I assumed that most of them were familiar with the usual Sunday School (and now day school) glorification of the missionaries now so common in our state. My purpose was to try to set matters in a little better perspective.

Mr. Gorrell takes exception to footnote No. 2 against the words in quotes "Plymouth colony." The reference is to that description of the proposed effort, which he admits is correct. I did not think it necessary to document Green's visit, assuming it was well enough known here. Mr. Gorrell just expects too much of the footnote.

He also takes marked exception to my use of Parker's journal. He says for instance, "Parker did not evidence surprise at finding Indians who had beliefs that were similar to Christianity: he simply listed their beliefs and did not say whether he thought they were like or unlike Christianity." Is that so? When Parker met his first Nez Percés who had been affected by primitive Anglicanism he records the service and says, "The whole sight so affected me; and filled me with admiration; and I felt as though it was the house of God and the gate of heaven." (p. 103). Meeting some Walla Walla worshiping in the same manner he wrote, "it was truly affecting to see their apparent reverence, order and devotion." (p. 275). Of the Spokanes he wrote, "these benighted Indians manifested the same solicitude to hear the gospel that the others have done before. And as a most affecting proof that the impressions then made on their minds were not momentary, they went home and erected in their village a church." (p. 291). To say that Parker merely listed their beliefs is quite inadequate; he was moved by what he saw and heard, and to interpret this as surprise does not seem to me to be far afield.

My documentation, as I have explained earlier, was for my guidance in answering questions and was not intended to be exhaustive. Having established earlier that Garry, educated at the Red River Mission of the Church of England, had taught a primitive form of Christianity to the Spokanes, I did not deem it necessary to repeat

that footnote. I did not, however, intend to imply that Parker said it was Garry.

Mr. Gorrell objects to my "virtual justification of the Whitman massacre." Whitman was wanted by the Cayuse Indians and after eleven years residence among them they murdered him. Why? Because he loved them? Hardly. I suggest that Mr. Gorrell read the letter written by the Reverend W. H. K. Perkins, formerly Methodist missionary at The Dalles, with whom Mrs. Whitman spent some time when Marcus made his famous ride east, to Jane Prentiss, Narcissa's sister, explaining why the massacre took place. It is to be found in Clifford Drury's *Marcus Whitman, M.D.*, pp. 458-460. The attack was "probably the most humane in Indian history." I stand by that statement!

Finally Mr. Gorrell takes me to task by implying that I said the "dichotomy between the missionary and the settler" was the cause of all the trouble. What I wrote was "This dichotomy between the missionary and the settler often led to conflict between the two, but more often, and especially in Oregon, it was so much part of the inrushing white man that he was unaware of it, even when he was a Christian missionary." This is the concluding sentence in a paragraph setting the Oregon Mission in its world-wide con-

text. In other lands, New Zealand for example, the missionaries sided with the natives against the settlers. It was the great weakness of the Oregon Missions that the missionaries who manned them, except for some Roman Catholics, were imbued with the idea of "manifest Destiny," and had actually very little sympathy for the Indians. As I wrote in my last paragraph, "the missionaries' obvious sympathy for the settler rather than those they came to convert, caused a reversion among the tribesmen." One can find plenty to document this fact in the letters of Marcus Whitman.

I want to thank Mr. Gorrell for providing me with additional information concerning the dual nature of the missionary efforts directed towards Oregon. But it was this duality of "Christianizing and civilizing," as the white man sees it, that has been so destructive of Christian missions. The native has no desire to see his own culture destroyed and replaced by that of the white man. For further comments along this line I would refer Mr. Gorrell to my article, "Christian Missions and the Dichotomy in Western Civilization," which appeared in the April 1959 issue of the *Anglican Theological Review*. If he cannot secure a copy I would be glad to send him one.

THOMAS E. JESSETT

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"The Piety of Englishmen Under Henry VII, 1485-1509." By Ted Hayden McDonald. University of Washington, 1957. 230 pp. L. C. Card No. Mic 58-292.

The object of this dissertation is to study the late mediaeval piety or spirituality of England as revealed in the common man during the reign of Henry VII. The religious practices of this era are revealed in the literary productions, wills, official documents, and the few remaining records of different organizations—religious and secular—of this period.

The work is divided into five main topics and the conclusion. The educational institutions, their curriculum and teaching staff are first considered.

The second topic is on the press and the literature of the period. Approximately half of the books printed during the reign of Henry VII were religious. What man did with his worldly goods just before death is revealed in the wills, testaments and inventories of the period. The average man left one-third of his wealth to the church. The fourth topic deals with the recreation of the people. The fairs, religious plays, and church festivals were the main recreational events. The fairs were owned or operated almost entirely by the church. Practically all plays were religious and there were very few secular festivals. The final topic deals with miscellaneous pious practices such as dating according to church festivals, religious expressions in correspondence, pilgrimages, penance, indulgences, etc.

After a close study of the above topics the conclusion is reached that there is a definite relation between the piety of the common man in England and the conservative nature of the English Reformation. The people were very pious, so much so that when the Reformation came it was this piety that activated them to overthrow the abuses of the mother church. Other forces,

such as patriotism, Tudor leadership, nationalism, etc., were also at work. However, piety did play a leading role in the English Reformation.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

"The Place of Reason in the Theology of Luther: A Study in the History of Ideas." By Brian Albert Gerrish (McCormick Theological Seminary). Columbia University, 1958. 329 pp. L. C. Card No. Mic 58-2587.

The first section shows how Luther's attitude towards reason is related to his fundamental dualism of an Earthly and a Heavenly Kingdom. If we are to do justice to the complexity of Luther's thought on the subject of "faith and reason" we must distinguish between: (1) natural reason, ruling within its proper domain (the Earthly Kingdom); (2) arrogant reason, trespassing upon the domain of faith (the Heavenly Kingdom); and (3) regenerate reason, serving humbly in the domain of faith, but always subject to the Word of God. Within the first context, reason is an excellent gift of God; within the second, it is the Devil's Whore; within the third, it is the handmaiden of faith. Similar conclusions are established concerning Luther's attitude towards Aristotelian philosophy: he does not object to philosophy in its own proper place, but only when it trespasses upon the domain of faith and the Word. A chapter is devoted to the question how far Luther's attitude towards reason was inherited by him from the Nominalist tradition in which he was trained; some parallels are acknowledged, but in anticipation of the second section it is argued that Luther's quarrel is precisely with the Nominalists at one crucial point.

The second section shows how Luther's attitude towards reason is related to his attack on legalism in religion. It is maintained that in the sec-

ond of the three contexts—namely, where reason is attacked for trespassing upon the domain of faith—the term “reason” stands, not so much for man’s rational capacities in general, but for the specific attitude of the natural man, who cannot think of religion in any other than legalistic terms. The attack against reason is, in fact, an attack against two false inferences which reason, before the regeneration of faith, habitually makes: (a) from the fact that God is just, it infers that He can be approached only by those who make themselves just; (b) from the fact that the Gospel denies the power of the law to justify men, it infers that the law is worthless and that men may as well live riotously. It is then shown how reason’s legalism is detected by Luther in the theology of the Schoolmen and especially in the Nominalism of the fourteenth century.

A third section attempts to set Luther’s intellectual activity within its historical context, and it is suggested that he shared in the general shift of interest away from Scholastic philosophy and towards Humanist scholarship; so that for him the proper place for the exercise of “reason” was in scholarship rather than philosophy. Some illustrations are given of Luther’s intellectual achievements in the area of his own choosing.

By permission from *Dissertation Abstracts*.

“The Covenant Theology of Johannes Cocceius.” By Charles Sherwood McCoy. Yale University, 1956. Director: H. Richard Niebuhr.

This study describes the covenant theology of Johannes Cocceius (1603-69) in relation to the Reformed tradition, in which it plays an important role, and contrasts his thought with scholastic Calvinism, a movement which threatened to replace the personal images of Scripture for the governance of God with analogies drawn from logical or even mechanical relations.

The theology of Cocceius is drawn

from Scripture and based upon broad Biblical scholarship. Cocceius regards exegesis as the most appropriate method in theology. Reason must be the servant, not the master, of God’s self-revelation. The primary systematic principle of Cocceius’ thought is the covenant. The covenant also is the analogy or metaphor through which God’s relation to the world and to man is understood. The successive phases of the covenant—that of works or nature, and that of grace—constitute the framework of Cocceian theology and mark it as part of the federal school of Reformed doctrine.

The dissertation also suggests the directions of Cocceius’ influence—his part in turning back the rising tide of Reformed scholasticism, his influence on pietism, the development of Biblical studies, and the *heilsgeschichtlich* school in theology. The covenant theology of Cocceius is an important element in seventeenth century theology and has much to teach us today.

“Protestantism and the Printing Workers of Lyons: A Study in the Problem of Religion and Social Class during the Reformation.” By Natalie Zemon Davis (Brown University). University of Michigan, June, 1959. Director: A. Hyma.

An intensive study of social and religious life in Lyons reveals no correlation between class position and religious choice during the first sixty years of Protestant development. The lay population fell into four groupings: an urban patriciate, ennobled through Consular membership but living as merchants and bankers; a middle class of well-off merchants and some master craftsmen; and the “menu people”—an upper stratum of petty merchants and many master craftsmen, and a lower stratum of journeymen and unskilled laborers. The names of 1301 male Protestants in sixteenth century Lyons were discovered and grouped according to class and trade. Their class distribution proves to be roughly the same as that of the total population.

This non-correlation is shown in detail in the printing industry. The growth of interest in Protestantism among rich merchant-publishers, master printers, and poor journeymen is traced, as well as the journeymen's eventual disenchantment with the Reformed Church and return to a moderate Catholicism. During the same years there were bitter strikes and litigation within the industry. It is demonstrated, however, that economic opponents were often religious allies; Catholic and Protestant journeymen worked together against Catholic and Protestant masters, publishers and officials.

That economic and political factors did not *determine* religious choice in Lyons is explained by the secularization of political and economic life in this urban center. The economic relations of the Lyons Catholic Church and the political traditions of the city led inhabitants to treat economic problems in naturalistic terms and enabled them not to confuse the Catholic clergy with their direct economic opponents. Significantly, economic factors had the most relevance for religious choice from 1562 to 1572, when the Consistory of Lyons attempted to shift the dividing line between the religious and secular spheres.

The compelling importance of religion in Lyons stemmed from its relation to such matters as sense-life; family and marriage; illness and death; and feelings of pride, confidence, and guilt. The factors determining religious choice are suggested by the *vocational* distribution of the Lyons Protestants. Men in occupations with certain intrinsic satisfaction (skill, novelty, social value of the product) were especially attracted to Protestantism, whether they were merchant-industrialists or journeymen. Printers and goldsmiths were more likely to become Protestants than were butchers and masons. The religious choices of the printers' journeymen are analyzed in terms of vocational traits established from contemporary sources. Their need for religious fellowship, which they hoped to satisfy in Protestantism, is

partly explained by the fact that many of them cut geographical and vocational ties with their families to enter this industry. Similarly, sources are suggested for their strong concern for sensuous experience, which worked for their return to the Catholic Church of the Counter-Reformation.

"The Old Norwegian Synod in America, 1853-1890." By G. L. Belgum (Luther College, Decorah, Iowa). Yale University, 1957.

From among the earliest of the 700,000 Norwegians who migrated to the U. S. between 1820 and 1920 a Norwegian-American Lutheran Synod was formed. "The Old Synod," begun officially in 1853, was to live through controversy and schism until 1917, when it united with two other synods to become the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

No European precedent existed for a free American Lutheran church. The Synod's leaders—Koren, the Preuses, Larsen, and Ottesen—drew upon their conservative training from Norway and their great teachers Johnson and Caspari; and on the basis of clearly articulated theological principles drawn from German sources and stimulated by Kierkegaard, the synod's pastors forged a dynamic church body. The theological background is examined in detail.

Highly influential upon the Synod was Walther, guiding genius of the Missouri Synod. At first the relation of Missouri to the Synod was educational, but soon Walther became the undoubted American mentor of the Synod's leaders. In official relationship within the Synodical Conference and through a stream of personal correspondence, Missouri exerted a strong influence. Hitherto unexamined letters throw much light upon the nature and extent of this influence.

The dissertation examines the type of piety of the Synod as well as the theological background and influences, and attempts to characterize the synod's leaders on the basis of primary documents.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Symposium, a Treatise on Chastity. By METHODIUS OF OLYMPUS. Translated by Herbert A. Musurillo, S. J. (Ancient Christian Writers, Volume XXVII.) Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958. vi, 249 pp. \$3.25.

This altogether admirable series continues on its way with a lucid and readable translation of one of the more peculiar documents of early Christian literature. Musurillo's 37-page introduction tells us all that we know and do not know about Methodius and his work and refers the reader to his own critical text, soon to appear in the series *Sources chrétiennes*. A problem is posed in relation to this work when Photius tells us that it was interpolated by Arians. On the basis of this statement Musurillo proceeds to suggest that in the fourth century there were already an "orthodox" and an "Arian" edition of it. I am not quite sure that this conclusion should be drawn. Photius was very eager to find heresy in those early Christian writings he did not like, and it may be that he knew what Methodius originally wrote—though, as Musurillo points out, "Photius has preserved many lines which do not fit into the *Symposium* as we have it today" (p. 25). Could these have been deleted during the doctrinal controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries?

The *Symposium* itself is interesting because of its combination of allegory with literalness, of faith with contemporary science, and its attempt to give a kind of Platonic veneer to materials which resist such glossing. It tries to make the most of two worlds of discourse, and, as the translator points out, does not quite reach its goal. But the work is well worth reading as a reminder that early Christian literature does not consist of mountain peaks alone. To a considerable extent the literature of the church is not pre-

served for its beauty of style or even its theological grasp, but simply for the witness it bears to Christian life at various times and in various places.

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of Chicago

Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. Vols. 7-8: *Pagan Symbols in Judaism.* By ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New York: Pantheon, 1958. \$15.00.

This review is a little late because the reviewer has been in a quandary. How, ultimately, does someone who knows not very much about art review a book which is intended to show what the symbols used by artists (nearly 2,000 years ago) meant then? By reading other reviews of Goodenough's magnificent volumes he can see the sorts of statements that ought to be made, or perhaps ought not to be made. Then he can go on to add a footnote or two to various pages of the work, or to argue about the interpretation of various artifacts, or to claim that Goodenough does (or does not) properly understand (a) the meaning of symbolic art in antiquity, (b) the relation of ancient Judaism to its environment, or (c) what this has to do with early Christianity. Perhaps such a retreat to dispassionate subjectivity would be directly related to the reviewer's lack of knowledge about the subject. But a careful consideration of the other reviews, of other studies of ancient Jewish and Christian art, and of the general problem of interpreting Judaism and Christianity suggests that some of the difficulties lie in the general problem of interpretation as such.

Is it possible to say that a particular symbol, e.g., a bull or a lion, meant precisely such-and-such (a) to an artist (pagan, Jewish, or Christian), (b) to those who first responded (or did not respond) to his work, and (c) to those who in later times have tried to inter-

pret its meaning? What kind of bells did the bull ring in the mind of (a) a religious-minded pagan (what kind of paganism?), (b) a Jew (apocalyptic-minded? semi-Gnostic? rabbinic?), or (c) a Christian¹ (so born? converted from Judaism? from paganism?)? To what extent does a psychological interpretation (Freudian? Jungian?) illuminate what a symbol meant then or means now?

I have asked a distinguished student of early Christian art about the "clusters of meaning" which symbols presumably conveyed when they were transferred from one environment (say pagan) to another (say Jewish or Christian). Specifically, there is the point that something "merely decorative" in one context might be regarded as more than merely decorative in another; and there is the related problem of how to determine whether something is merely decorative or not. The answer he gave me left me in my original situation of doubt—doubt as to my ability to answer such questions.

The situation seems to resemble that in which one tries to interpret other kinds of phenomena in which a multiplicity of meanings is at least potentially present. For instance, when one tries to interpret the Pauline epistles one is by no means as sure as the commentaries would suggest that one knows exactly what the apostle meant. In his background lie Tarsus, Jerusalem, and the road to Damascus. When he uses a Greek word also found in the Septuagint, how many "clusters of meaning" from the Septuagint (which parts of the Septuagint?) does it carry with it? Does he use the ordinary Greek (if we can speak of such an entity) of his time? Did those who first read his letters understand them (a) in any uniform way, or (b) at all? Similar problems arise if one turns to the Fourth Gospel. Its background is undoubtedly Jewish, but what do we mean by "Jewish"? Is the book to be adjusted to the Procrustean bed of Qumran, of the Jerusalem church, of Hellenistic Judaism, or of proto-Gnosticism? To ask these questions is

to admit that they cannot be definitely answered.

Then are we left in a situation in which we can only congratulate Goodenough on his collections of pictures and admire his productivity? To some extent this is the case. To Goodenough Jewish symbols mean what he says they mean; to others they will convey, as they have conveyed, somewhat different meanings. In order to escape from this purely subjective admiration we must go on to ask why it is that these volumes exist. Apart from Goodenough's own devotion to the subject, they exist in order to make a contribution to the study of Judaism and Christianity in their Graeco-Roman environment. This study is not simply the collection of data to be run through an IBM machine. It is a process of modern life and thought which is intended to bring us toward clearer understanding of a crucial period in the early history of these two religions. The understanding, which will never be perfect, comes through the "dialogue" between creative scholars and the materials which they assemble. Understanding is advanced when a scholar achieves a fruitful insight, or cluster of insights, in relation to his materials and expresses it in such a way that it makes them come alive. The danger lies in the possibility that he may make them more alive than they really were; the dead bones may be really dead. The advance in the process of scholarship comes when his insight illuminates not only the materials with which he deals but also the materials with which those who investigate other lines are dealing. In this sense I should not hesitate to regard Goodenough's work as one of the most significant contributions to the study of late Judaism and of early Christianity that has been made in our generation.

Specifically, church historians who are concerned with Christian origins (as all of them should be) cannot fail to learn something about Jewish and Christian symbols, about the relation of the early church to its world, about Goodenough, and about themselves. To learn such things ought to help

them as they move toward the new picture of Christian origins which is in process of creation.

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of Chicago

The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew. By FRANCIS DVORNIK. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958. (Dumbarton Oaks Studies IV). x, 342 pp. \$6.00.

The new book of Father Dvornik requires more than a cursory review. Indeed, the author deals here with that crucial issue on which the Christian East and the Christian West ultimately were estranged from each other. What was the guiding principle in the evolution of Church organization? Father Dvornik states plainly that "the early Church found a model for its organization in the political organization of the Roman Empire rather than in the apostolic tradition" (4). This principle had been initiated, according to Father Dvornik, already by the Apostles themselves. The Christian East applied this principle persistently in the development of higher forms of Church organization, i.e., higher than the ordinary diocesan unit. Attention was paid primarily to the actual prominence of particular episcopal sees, and an "apostolic" origin of the see was never regarded as a decisive argument for precedence. Accordingly, it was possible to raise even new sees to prominence, and to ascribe administrative authority to them, if it seemed justified by the actual role of these sees in the total administrative fabric of the Christian Society. Such was the case of Constantinople, "the New Rome."

On the other hand, in the West "authority" was closely associated with the prerogatives of the "apostolic sees," especially, of course, of the See of St. Peter. The East, however, has never been seriously impressed by this Western model. This divergence of administrative principles and patterns became one of the sharpest issues between Byzantium and Rome. Father Dvornik follows this controversy step by step. He shows quite convincingly that even

in the time of Photius the argument from "apostolic foundation" was not used in order to vindicate the authority of Constantinople. Accordingly, little use had been made of the "Legend of the Apostle Andrew," which originated probably in the late seventh century.

Obviously, this adjustment of the canonical structure of the Church to the political structure of the Empire was not just a matter of expediency. It was intimately connected with the concept of one indivisible "society," the Christian Commonwealth, or the Christian Empire. "Parallelism" was implied in this basic pattern. Indeed, the same conception dominated also Western thought in the Middle Ages. But the actual situation was different. "The Empire" was still in the East. Father Dvornik will deal with this wider problem in his new book, *The Origins of Christian Political Philosophy*, now in preparation. It will be a welcome sequel to his present book.

There is another aspect of the problem which is not adequately clarified by Father Dvornik. The Church as such, i.e., the Church Universal, is herself "Apostolic," and consequently all her constitutive components, i.e., all particular diocesan sees, are also "apostolic," and all bishops are in "apostolic succession," are successors to the Apostles. For that reason lists of succession in each particular see were carefully kept in the Ancient Church. Now, what was the relation between this inherent "apostolicity" of every see and the "privileges" of certain "apostolic sees"? It is highly significant that, in the process of the growth of metropolitan and supermetropolitan superstructures, great care was taken to secure the full authority of every bishop in his own diocese, so that metropolitans or patriarchs should not interfere with this "ordinary" jurisdiction. Was the concept of "episcopacy" precisely the same in Byzantium and in Rome? It is probably at this point that we touch upon the ultimate root of their divergence in the canonical sphere. It is highly significant that in the West a concept of the "episcopacy" was evolved, by

which the difference between "priesthood" and "episcopate" was construed as one of jurisdiction, and "episcopacy" was not regarded as a distinct sacramental order. "Episcopacy" is not mentioned in the authoritative list of orders approved by the Council of Trent. This development was absolutely alien to the Christian East. Unfortunately, there is no monographic study of this important matter. An inquiry into this matter would probably have deepened the masterly analysis of the problem presented by Father Dvornik in his present book. It must be carefully studied by all church historians. We are deeply grateful to the author.

GEORGES FLOROVSKY

Harvard Divinity School

Humanisme et Renaissance (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, No. 30). By AUGUST RENAUDET. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1958. 279 pp. F. 50.

Mlle. Droz invited this celebrated scholar to collect for this volume a number of his articles, reviews, and other minor fruits of his researches and reflection on Renaissance humanism. Doubtless it was to honor his career of fifty years as a contributor in this field to the learned journals. The first to have been published (1908) was his still valuable study of Standonck; the last (1958) to be written and here appearing for the first time has for its subject Petrarch's humanistic ethic and his spirituality. In all there are eighteen pieces, dealing with figures named in the subtitle: Dante, Petrarch, Standonck, Erasmus, Le Fèvre, Marguerite of Navarre, Rabelais, Guicciardini, and Giordano Bruno. We can be reasonably certain that the author presented here the writings he most approved, so that we may say they are the best of Renaudet's minor writings on the said subject.

A favorite theme of Professor Renaudet is Christian humanism, which he finds in Italy as well as north of the Alps. It is heartening to have so much learning on this side of the argument, for even today there are those who see mainly the paganism affected

by some humanists. In part, however, the author argues from a definition of humanism as a certain confidence in man's natural endowments. This is largely 19th century afterthought. It would make Renaissance humanism extend from deep in the Middle Ages to the 20th century. A virtue of this definition is that such confidence, wherever or whenever found, need not be incompatible with a Christian's humble walk before God. The intellectualism of Dante is brought into the argument, but, while we should prize a Christian like him among the humanists, it is not easy to show that he exemplifies what is more specifically characteristic of Renaissance humanism. If Dante, why not Thomas Aquinas? (In fact, Renaudet tends to favor the idea of E. Gilson and other neo-scholastics about humanism, which sees it in St. Thomas and others.) One could easily go back to the 11th century which saw the first of the glossators of the Roman law. If confidence in human nature is not especially the hallmark of Renaissance humanism, neither is doubt of the eternal value of man's natural capabilities unique to the medieval period. As in Renaissance business, conscience with respect to usury and profit-taking was not dead, so among humanists the night could be troubled by dreams like St. Jerome's about the love of Cicero.

Professor Renaudet tends to confirm the idea that humanism was the deadly foe of scholasticism. It is true that only comparatively recently has this idea come to be very critically examined. Writings are now appearing which show how much certain leading humanist educational reformers took over from scholastic logic, and also how exciting a scholastic disputation could be so late as 1600. Mention may here be made of Walter J. Ong, S. J., *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* and William T. Costello, S. J., *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge*, both published by the Harvard Press in 1958. There was something of a feud between humanist professors and the scholastic professors, whom the former called barbarians. We can charge

much of such hot language to professional rivalry. The issue of issues—if any there was—pertained to the competent use in speech and writings of classical Latin, which involved mastery of the classical literature. The humanists gave birth to modern philology, which in turn helped produce modern historical criticism. (The author recognizes humanistic philology in so many words, p. 37, but soon leaves it to press the idea of the confidence in human capabilities.) They also tended toward subordinating dialectic and/or logic to rhetoric, which helped popularize knowledge. But all this did not necessarily imply a destruction of the basics of the scholastic method of teaching: lecture, disputation, declamation, and such. One can even find all these in Melancthon's Wittenberg.

Such reservations do not appreciably lessen the satisfaction derived from these writings. Much in them is solidly based on sources, which gives them a permanent worth. Outstanding are the pieces on Standonck and Petrarch, and always—as, too, in his books—whatever the author has to say of Erasmus is particularly attractive. Of Erasmus he has an extraordinary knowledge, and for him his heart beats faster than for any other figure of the Renaissance era.

QUIRINUS BREEN

University of Oregon

The Life of Girolamo Savonarola.
By ROBERTO RIDOLFI. Translated
from the Italian by Cecil Grayson.
New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.
326 pp. \$7.50.

Roberto Ridolfi's life of Savonarola, first published in 1952, ranks with the major biographies by Pasquale Villari and Joseph Schnitzer. With a great deal of new material, much of which he first made available in critical studies and editions in a quarter century of labor, Ridolfi has advanced toward a clear and trustworthy narrative, solving many problems and correcting the story at important points. He tells us all there is to know about Savonarola's formative years and beginnings in Florence. He straightens the chronology of the sermons (which

he and others are now publishing in a national edition of Savonarola's works). He illuminates the details of the struggle for the foundation of the new reformed Congregation of San Marco and of Savonarola's relations with the Medici and with Pope Alexander VI, and he expertly delineates the truth and forgery in Savonarola's "confessions." Professor Ridolfi, in his distinctive style, retells the story perhaps more vividly than it has ever been told before, bringing out the heroic and tragic qualities it really did have and making the strongest possible case for the friar's humanity and integrity.

This translation comes to us mutilated by the complete omission of the invaluable notes that in the Italian make up almost the entire second volume. Without them what remains chiefly to be considered is Ridolfi's interpretation of Savonarola, and this is unsatisfactory. Ridolfi has the right of it with respect to Villari and Schnitzer, I am convinced, in insisting that Savonarola's *raison d'être* was his zeal for religious reform, and that his prophesying and his statesmanship, as indeed all else, sprang from this. But it is quite another thing to maintain that in the adolescent there was already "not only the germ of his future actions and life, but also their whole and perfect image." By starting with this supposition Ridolfi makes Savonarola's life seem to play itself out according to its own internal laws, without any significant development and curiously above the life and thought of its time. After all, a good deal of discussion has been raised about the problem of influences upon Savonarola, from fifteenth century popular apocalypticism, from his relations with Pico and other Florentine philosophers, humanists and poets, and from Florentine civic and political traditions and from daily exigencies. But Ridolfi barely considers Savonarola's ideas in any analytical way and so we are asked to accept a monolithic Savonarola upon whom, once formed, the external world made little significant impression.

Sometimes it is unfair to criticize an author for not doing what he has not set out to do. In his preface Professor

Ridolfi says he has aimed to write "simply a biography," leaving the study of the friar's works to others and letting his life "speak openly of his doctrine—his life, which among his many books is undoubtedly his best one." As a value judgment this need not be disputed, but as a principle of biography it is insufficient. Can biography divorce action from thought or thought from its environment? One example ought to suffice to make the point. In his second sermon on Hag-gai, probably on December 9, 1494, Savonarola, for the first time, promised Florence great riches and extension of her empire as the rewards of moral reform. This emphasis on Florence and worldly rewards appears to me to have constituted a new stage in Savonarola's development and a major modification of his earlier eschatology, and it is necessary to ask how and why it came about and what consequences it had. But Professor Ridolfi does not mention the prophecy, much less analyze it.

The author's great affection for Savonarola and his sense of familial and patriotic indebtedness (he is a Florentine, directly descended from some of the principal actors in the Savonarola drama as well as from Lorenzo de' Medici) must be partly responsible for the power of the book. But instead of giving him the "balance of judgment" he hoped it would, Ridolfi's inheritance has had the opposite effect, it seems to me. Ridolfi's attempts to smooth Savonarola's undeniable harshness and priggishness toward his parents, his dismissal of all opposition to the friar as malevolent, his constant likening of Savonarola's life—and death—to Jesus, his continual insertion of legends attesting to Savonarola's sanctity become rhetorical and wearisome. Particularly on the matter of Savonarola's prophecy Ridolfi's fine critical sense abandons him. To strive to prove that "it is an undeniable fact that Savonarola's prophecies constantly came true" is to play a game with elastic rules. A sample case of stretching is Ridolfi's assertion that the friar's prophecy of the conversion of the in-

fidel came true in the discovery of America!

Cecil Grayson's translation is excellent, even capturing some of the flavor of Ridolfi's language and style. Among the infrequent slips are the rendering of *un monaco nero di Badia* as "a Dominican from the Abbey," (p. 267) instead of as "a Benedictine monk from the Badia Fiorentina," and the persistent translation of *frate* as "monk" rather than as "friar."

DONALD WEINSTEIN

University of Wisconsin

The New Cambridge Modern History, Volume II: The Reformation, 1520-1559. Edited by G. R. ELTON. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1958. 686 pp. \$7.50.

For church historians, this volume on the Reformation in the "New Cambridge Modern History" series is of interest because of the variety of its approaches to an important period, though the limitations of the first "Cambridge Modern History" are still present and have become more evident in an age when books are shorter and scholars less thorough. The purpose of the new series is described by its general editor, Sir G. N. Clark, as "neither . . . a stepping-stone to definitive history, nor . . . an abstract or a scale-reduction of all our knowledge of the period, but as a coherent body of judgments true to the facts" (I, xxxiv).

The new series recedes from only one of Lord Acton's principles which were carried out in the first series, namely, that contributors need no longer conceal their individual convictions. Much current scholarly opinion agrees with this newer, un-Rankean view, and probably all scholars would agree if the right to subjective opinion does not receive extravagant abuse. So far as "The Reformation" is concerned the newer view comes off well since the twenty contributors have succeeded in preventing their own views from becoming controversial, as Roman Catholic reviewers admit. In fact, the Reformation is presented within an atmosphere which is conservative and even stodgy. Here are some unsatis-

fyling catalogues and pointless chronicles. On the other hand, limitations of space and manner of treatment often prevent the development of issues interesting to scholars. In spite of the statement of purpose quoted above, there is too much "scale-reduction of knowledge" and not enough "judgment true to the facts." Moreover, bibliographies have disappeared entirely.

Yet fifty years have brought some improvements. Economic, social, and cultural factors supplement the older tendency to keep talking all of the time about politics in church and state. Agrarian change and Antwerp as a trade center receive separate attention (by Friedrich Luetge and S. T. Bind-off), though these have little relation to what follows. Intellectual factors are not overlooked although a section on the printed book by Denys Hay, a section on science by A. R. Hall, and a chapter on schools and universities by Denys Hay scarcely do justice to the art, literature, and theology of the age. In all fairness, one must note that the first two of these receive more ample treatment in the new Volume One on the Renaissance. As one would expect, religion is treated more fully than formerly and Gordon Rupp's chapter on Luther and his sections on reformers in Zürich, Strassburg, and Geneva are especially fresh, though he adds nothing to historical scholarship. An augmented section on Anabaptists by Ernest Payne is fair and in accord with prevailing scholarship, though it plods.

Obscure areas and persons receive more adequate treatment, from the standpoint of one who is not specially working in them. The Scandinavian Reformation by N. K. Andersen is an example, and Spanish missions in the New World by J. H. Parry is another. One chapter (by V. J. Parry) quite properly tries to rescue the Ottoman Empire from the limbo of Christian historians, and while a chapter by J. L. I. Fennell examines Russia, I. A. Macgregor fills us in on the relations of Europe to the Orient. Delio Cantimori's chapter on Italy and the Papacy

is illuminating and expert. The Inquisition and Catholic reform receive too little attention, although there is a full chapter by H. O. Evennett devoted to new Catholic orders.

Though Germans, a Dane, and an Italian are among the contributors, there is no doubt that Cambridge is the spiritual home of this volume. Unfortunately the English editors have bent over backwards at the wrong place by treating the English Reformation in only one chapter, adequate though that chapter by G. R. Elton is. Thus there is no overwhelming strength at any point in this work.

Three additional chapters may be referred to insofar as they enlarge one's perspective on the Reformation, which is the main asset of this book. One is a striking chapter on war, armies, and navies by J. R. Hale. Two other chapters by G. R. Elton and R. R. Betts look at constitutional developments in West and East. Again there are limitations. The section on Germany fell through because of illness, and on the whole the constitutional developments discussed relate to cerebral rather than to functional aspects of human experience, a vice which one would ordinarily associate more with philosophers and theologians than with historians.

Everything considered, this volume must be described as disappointing. One has to express unqualified gratification for the responsibility and balance of this book. Yet it is occasionally laborious reading. In this respect it is probably a rather faithful reflection of the state of historical studies at the present time.

LOWELL H. ZUCK
Eden Theological Seminary

A History of Modern Germany, The Reformation. By HAJO HOLBORN. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959. xvi, 374, xxi pp. \$8.95.

Professor Von Campenhausen of the University of Heidelberg once inscribed a book to Professor Holborn in these terms: "To the secular historian who ought to have been a Church historian from the Church historian who ought to have been a secular historian."

Certainly Holborn knows his way around in the realm of ecclesiastical history. Yet one would make a mistake to approach this volume, despite its title, as primarily a history of the Reformation. It is the first volume in a history of modern Germany and covers the period of the Reformation and the Thirty Years War. The first third of the book brings the account only up to the Reformation. The second third deals with the rise of Protestantism and the concluding portion is devoted to the Catholic Reformation in brief and the Thirty Years War.

Social, political and religious history are kept in balance and the concluding paragraph discloses the dominant concern in that it sums up the political consequences for Germany of the Reformation and the Thirty Years War. At the same time the religious issues are introduced and comprehended to a singular degree in a work by a "profane" historian. In the treatment of Luther one discerns in spots the influence of Holborn's teacher Karl Holl. The newness of the book lies chiefly in its skillful manipulation of the interplaying forces so that the thrust and counter-thrust of Catholic orthodoxy and German national feeling, French or Turkish intervention, passionate reformatory indignation, papal politics and peasant unrest fit into a dynamic pattern with the neatness and inevitability of predestination.

There are minor points all along the line which prompt queries, but a review of this compass should not be encumbered with minutiae.

ROLAND H. BAINTON

Yale Divinity School

The Influence of Erasmus, Witzel and Cassander in the Church Ordinances and Reform Proposals of the United Duches of Cleve During the Middle Decades of the 16th Century. (Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, Heft 83). By J. P. DOLAN. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1958. 119 pp. DM. 9, 80.

The author traces "the continuity of a stream of Catholic humanistic reform

that ante-dates the Luther reformation and flows along Erasmian lines of conciliatory policy to its culmination in liturgical approach to secular church policy in the lower Rhine" (108). He investigates the Church ordinances and reform proposals of the United Duches of Cleve from ca. 1530-1560. He has observed that these documents manifest the *Vermittlungstheologie* of Erasmus, Witzel and Cassander. The presentation is based on a careful analysis of printed and unprinted material. One misses, however, a detailed reference to and discussion of such an important work as Robert Stupperich's *Der Humanismus und die Wiederrückbildung der Konfessionen* (Schriften d. Ver. f. Ref. gesch., Heft 160, 1936). Dolan attempts to show that the Reformation in the United Duches of Cleve was not a reformation in Luther's sense; he feels that it was the ideal type of a reformation within the Roman Catholic Church, which under certain circumstances could have created a *modus vivendi* for Luther.

The author does not carefully differentiate between the reform program of the *Vermittlungstheologie* and Luther's stand on theology and reform. One has sometimes the feeling that Dolan confuses Luther with the Humanistic reform theologians (26); at the same time he seems to be well aware of differences which existed between Luther's theology and that of the Catholic reformers (v, vii, 108). An examination of Stupperich's book (mentioned above) could have aided in coming to definite conclusions. It also could have shown that the *conciliatory theology and policy of the Humanists was doomed from the very beginning to be unsuccessful*. Although this fact is touched upon (17, 109, 110), it seems that Dolan is not fully aware of it with all its consequences.

In addition to this the question arises: what is *Vermittlungstheologie*? The author's answer ("the continuity of a stream of Catholic humanistic reform that ante-dates the Luther reformation" [108, italics mine]) is insufficient. The late medieval origin of the *via media* is described only vaguely and

its essence not precisely demonstrated. Especially the problem of uniformity and variety within the *Vermittlungstheologie* loses colour and disappears.

For the author, Erasmus, Witzel, and Cassander represent the Humanistic reform program within the Roman Catholic Church (39, 89, 108). He states, however, that there is also a basic difference, at least between Erasmus on the one side and Witzel and Cassander on the other (vii, 23, 86, 87, 88). Their specific concerns are to be seen in a particular position on liturgy (56, 86). Witzel and Cassander emphasize liturgy and the religious life of the Early Church; they consider these two elements to be the solution to the issues which had been raised by the Protestant Reformation. Although not expressed by Dolan, the necessary implication of such an interpretation is that Erasmus neglected the religious life of the Early Church. Would this agree with the actual attitude which Erasmus had towards the Early Church?

Things become more unclear when Dolan writes: "*The continuity of the Erasmian tone of these proposals [the Church Ordinances of the United Duchies of Cleve] cannot be doubted, yet the evidence of greater development through Witzel, especially evidenced in the communal, socio-caritative elements, cannot be rejected*" (86, italics mine). "The contribution that he [Cassander] made to the modifications in the proposed Church Ordinances . . . for example, in the administration of Holy Communion at each mass, the chalice is to be offered to the layman" (88, 89). The author sees the contribution which the Witzel-Cassander team made to the reform proposals primarily in a new interest in the "communal" life of the Early Church, especially its liturgy. Is this different from Erasmus? Dolan's presentation suggests it. This view is not, however, supported with Erasmian material.

This *unconcern for Erasmus and his ideas* may be observed whenever the author evaluates the specific ideas which Erasmus or Witzel or Cassander

gave to the *Vermittlungstheologie*. Dolan distinguishes between "Erasmian reform program and evangelism" (23); he states that Witzel's and Cassander's concern "was not only with the moral breakdown of the time but with the more important problem of divine cult" (111). What does this mean? Does the author suggest that Erasmus stood only for moral rearmament while Witzel and Cassander fought for evangelism, piety, worship and liturgy? If this is really his intention, why does he not state this and prove it? However, only a total lack of understanding of Erasmus could bring one to such a conclusion.

The fact that Witzel and Cassander favoured the communion *sub utraque speciei* is used by Dolan to illustrate their concern for the Liturgy of the Early Church. The author may know of Erasmus' attitude toward the eucharistic question and of the way in which he handled the problem (cf. Erasmus, *Opus Epistolarum*, ed. P. S. Allen, Vol. IV, No. 1039). His presentation, however, does not show this; on the contrary it appears that Witzel and Cassander would be the sole exponents of the communion *sub utraque speciei*. How close Erasmus and Cassander were becomes obvious if one compares the terminology which they applied to the Eucharist.

Nr. 202, 249a: De missae nomine contendendum non est. Certum enim est Latinos scriptores aetate B. Ambrosii eo nomine usos fuisse ad significandam sacram illam actionem, in qua commemoratio dominicae mortis, ex ipsius instituto sanctificatione ac communicatione mystici panis et vini celebrantur, adhibitis precibus, lectionibus et ceremoniis ab ecclesia praepositis institutis ad huius mysterii dignitatem amplificandam, et populum ad dignam sacramentorum participationem preparandum. (90, note 17, italics mine).

For Erasmus the Lord's Supper is a *sacrosanctum symbolum* (Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum curavit I.F.S. Augustin, Berlin, 1178, I, 258/59), *mystica coena* (op. cit. II, 622), or a mystical act by which the death of the Lord is constantly represented that he never may be forgotten (op. cit. III, 434; Werke, ed. Holborn, München,

1933, 74, 4ff.). The elements are a great secret; they are the mystical bread and the sacred cup; they are used *ad arcanæ rei repræsentationem* (Paraphrases, *op. cit.* I, 259; III, 434). Do these terms represent different realities? Or is the same theological idea expressed in different terms? Did Cassander depend on Erasmus? If so, did he merely enlarge upon Erasmus and his ideas? Or did he partially or even totally deviate from them?

A more detailed study of Erasmus and his theological work would have raised these questions; their answers would have avoided the hazy formulations and views which prevent Dolan's work from attaining the position it deserves. In spite of these shortcomings this little study will be of definite value, especially through the careful analysis of the works of Witzel and Cassander and the report on the events in the United Duches of Cleve during the middle decades of the 16th century.

GOTTFRIED G. KRODEL

Concordia College
Moorhead, Minnesota

Saint Augustin dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin. By MAG. DR. LUCHESIUS SMITS. Assen: Van Gorcum. Vol. I, *Étude de critique littéraire*, 1957, 336 pp.; Vol. II, *Table des références augustiniennes*, 1958, 295 pp.

If the problem of the relation of Calvin to Augustine has never been studied in detail, it may be because no one interested had the fortitude to undertake the preliminary task of providing an index of direct references. This Luchsius Smits has done with astounding industry. Although the author's conclusions about Calvin's understanding of Augustine are reserved for a final volume that is not yet published, the first two volumes as they stand are a solid contribution to the knowledge of Calvin, a basic tool for all subsequent evaluation of his intellectual antecedents.

Dr. Smits has combed the complete works of both authors, including pseudo-Augustinian works and African church councils, and raised the number of known references to Augustine by

Calvin from approximately 1500 to a new total of 4100. Of these Calvin himself gives the citation for 1700 and Dr. Smits has identified the remaining 2400 and indexed the whole by page and line. Volume II, if we may mention it first, contains one table in which the references are classified according to the works of Calvin as they appear in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, and another classified by an alphabetical arrangement of Augustine's works, indexed to Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. A small table of eighteen quotations contains Augustinian material the author could not identify with assurance. Calvin's *Institutes* are keyed to the *Opera Selecta*. The volume also includes a chronological listing of the writings of both Augustine and Calvin, a precise critical apparatus and an index.

Volume I presents a literary analysis of the relation between the Reformer and the Bishop of Hippo, showing first that in Calvin's early years' as student and humanist Augustine's writings played a considerable, but conventional, role. Then the author advances the novel view that the words "Saint Augustin m'a fait ouverture à entendre ce precepte," (*Institutes*, II. viii.50) refer to Calvin's conversion. "The reading of St. Augustine had suddenly opened the eyes of this humanist and confirmed for him the principles of the Reformation . . ." (p. 23). We must grant a role to Augustine in bringing about Calvin's protestantism, but I think it is somewhat overdrawn to supply the word "suddenly" and relate the reading of *De Spiritu et Littera* to the moment of conversion implied in Calvin's preface to the Commentary on Psalms. Chapter 2 is a fine literary history of Calvin's writings with meticulous attention given throughout to the problem in hand, and the results frequently summarized and illustrated by charts. The new fund of Calvin sermons now being edited will not affect this work, because Calvin rarely cited Augustine in preaching. Chapter 3 is a literary history of Augustine's writings analyzing Calvin's use of various parts and showing that Calvin read Augustine in Erasmus' edition and on

occasion advanced beyond Erasmus' judgment of the authenticity of certain works. In the final chapters, the author comes tantalizingly close to the theological matter he is reserving for Volume III. He presents Calvin's admirable critical and hermeneutical principles for the reading of Augustine and warns against pre-judging Calvin's sincerity on the basis of "subsequent errors of interpretation." Augustine represents for Calvin an "unequalled doctrinal authority" (p. 259), but only because he more than anyone else in the early church stood up well when Calvin tested him by Scripture. This view throws some doubt on whether the term "authority" should be used at all in this connection. Probably it should be reserved for Calvin's view of scripture. Augustine's dogmatic writings, especially those against the Pelagians, were Calvin's favorites. The philosophical writings were generally either passed by or rejected as too Platonic. Calvin estimated Augustine's exegetical method lower than Chrysostom's, because Augustine, verse by verse, tended to be oversubtle and allegorical, although Calvin preferred his grasp of the chief biblical themes. Dr. Smits errs, I think, in saying that Calvin called a wrong number in Acts 7:14 "a simple slip of the pen of the inspired author" (p. 268), where Calvin actually attributes the slip to copyists (*ex errore librariorum*). The bibliography is excellent.

The "literary" conclusions drawn thus far by Dr. Smits, namely, that Calvin admired the early fathers more than the medieval, that he preferred Augustine above all others, quoted him extensively, yet often differed sharply with him, will not surprise anybody,—although the thoroughness with which this is now documented is enlightening. It remains to be seen whether the final volume of this Louvain thesis, which bears a most inconspicuous imprimatur, will produce a serious revision in the understanding of Calvin's relation to Augustine. In the meantime we welcome these volumes as an excellent reference work, containing valuable new data on which

to base a thorough study.

EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR.
Princeton Theological Seminary

Concordia Mundi: The Career and Thought of Guillaume Postel (1510-1581). By WILLIAM J. BOUWSMA. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957. 330 pp. \$6.50.

Guillaume Postel is one of the most fascinating figures of the sixteenth century because he mirrored so many of the concerns of his time. The great passion of his life was unity alike in the realm of faith and of fact. He was imbued with the Stoic faith in the concord of the universe, manifest in the heavenly bodies, in the animals and supremely in the mind of man. This harmony should find concretion in a universal empire to be achieved preferably by peaceful means, but if these failed then by a crusade in which leadership should be taken by France. Shades of Pierre Dubois! Yet France was not indispensable and when her kings were cool Postel turned to the empire and even to Venice.

In the realm of faith he desired to win the Mohammedans and their spiritual kinsmen, the Protestants, to Catholic orthodoxy. The program of the Jesuits enlisted his enthusiasm and for a time he belonged to the order, but his intense French nationalism occasioned a friendly dismissal. Primarily in the interests of missionary conversion he took advantage of a trip to Constantinople to learn Arabic and Syriac. He brought out the first Arabic grammar in the west. And he pled for a better understanding of the Turks. In seeking to win them for the faith he combined the linguistic approach of Raymond Lull and the theological approach of Raymond of Sabunde in the reduction of Christian dogma to the minimum. Postel fraternized with the Protestants and even with those to the left, such as Schwenckfeld, the Family of Love and even the Davidists, the followers of David Joris.

Postel's program was affected by another influence derived from his Semitic studies, that of the Cabala, from which came the conviction that the di-

vine glory, the Shekinah, must have a female as well as a male representation. Upon the saintly Juliana of Venice he believed the Shekinah to have descended, and after her death, upon himself, though obviously he did not illustrate quite the same principle.

The Inquisition deemed him mad and he was imprisoned for four years till the death of Paul IV. Then the King of France consigned Postel to the protective custody of a monastery near Paris. Here he remained for eighteen years. His detention was ever more relaxed and he came to be revered as a saintly and venerable pundit.

As a scholar his contribution lay in the dissemination of Semitic studies. He was a religious syncretist, a Catholic apologist, a prophet of world unity, another of the world's frustrated dreamers.

The biography is the work of meticulous labor. It displays a rich background of evaluation and delineates sympathetically a bizarre and appealing figure.

ROLAND H. BAINTON

Yale Divinity School

The Visible Words of God. An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli, A.D. 1500-1562. By JOSEPH C. McLELLAND. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957. 291 pp. \$4.00.

This is a highly welcome study of a Reformer about whom no monograph has been written in the last hundred years. But Peter Martyr's theology is of great stature. That he is a stranger to us is our own fault and not his. Apparently he has not drawn any groups, schools or denominations to praise him as a champion, pioneer or forefather of any "concern" dear to themselves. His importance comes into focus only when we are ready to admit that there is room for a great contribution to protestant faith (of the "reformed" branch) by a contemporary of the "Zwinglians" and "Calvinists", who is not to be identified with either group (although he was very close to Calvin, less in his methods than in his results),

who felt and fought together with Bucer, but without letting himself be alienated from Zurich and Geneva. The author says, in one of his very important Appendices (C, entitled "Bucer, Calvin and Martyr"): "What is most striking is that while Lutheran could agree with Bucer, and 'Zwinglian' with Martyr, Bucer and Martyr were conscious of being one in doctrine and purpose" (p. 280). Indeed, "there was a degree of unity existing among the Reformers far beyond what their successors allow, or have since maintained" (p. 278).

Deeply rooted in his vast patristic studies (see Appendix B), not ashamed of his thorough training in Aristotelian logic, Martyr's thought seems to call for a comparison with Melancthon's (an interesting task left for a future study). But the Italian Reformer had the gift of the *clarté latine*. Without painful shifts, compromises or mystifications, his thought moved dynamically, serenely and firmly at the same time, and his expression of it always remained concise and understandable. In following Dr. McLelland's able exposition of Martyr's doctrine, we taste something of the sober "beauty of theology."

The sacraments, notably the Lord's Supper, are in the center of Martyr's theology. They are as far as possible from being special *loci* of doctrine (then easily becoming appendices to a "more general theology"). Rather Martyr's whole dealing with the problems of revelation, divine presence, the Church and the Christian life (as a sacrifice of thanksgiving) is "sacramental," that is to say, it always moves from that which is signified and exhibited to that which signifies and exhibits it, and back from the sign to its true "cause" or reason or "matter." In all forms of communion with and in Christ we have to maintain "what is proper to Christ Himself" (p. 226); and this means that there is only one way of encountering Christ, not several that would compete with and replace each other. Only the Holy Spirit guarantees that God's work for us is not altered, replaced or emptied in the

sacraments, but maintained and perfected, so that in them we have the whole effect or "virtue" of the person of Christ. In seeking other guarantees, the sacrament would become analogous to a false (Nestorian or Monophysite) understanding of the hypostatic union.

No other Reformer has made such an extensive use of the concept of analogy. But is this concept more than an explanatory tool? Could it become something like a heuristic principle? On the whole, the author's exposition shows us clearly enough that "the formal analogy becomes a positive error unless the Holy Spirit 'fills' its terms with the proportion between God and man given to faith in the person of Jesus Christ" (p. 85, see also p. 172). However, some of the author's interpretations, particularly such as concern Lutheranism, seem to introduce the analogical character of the incarnation as a methodical principle, a key notion to solve all other problems (e.g. pp. 125 and 208). Furthermore if there should be an intention to show in Martyr a "sacramental theology," in which the sacraments are not only (and soundly) understood in analogy to the incarnation, but also, in the reverse way, everything in our faith becomes "sacramental," then we should not think ourselves to be any longer on Martyr's ground or any other Reformer's doctrine. Evidently the word "sacrament" as used in Martyr's writings has more than one meaning (one of them being "mystery" in the most general sense). The author gives several indications of this problem. But a systematic semantic study of this and related words could have been very helpful for the otherwise excellent presentation of a dynamic, deep and sober theology.

Martyr's biography, under the title "Portrait of an Ecumenical Reformer" (pp. 1-68), is included in the form of an introduction to the doctrinal part of the book. Copious quotations from the primary sources are given in good English translation. Unfortunately, references to the original Latin are rather scarce. The bibliography of Martyr's writings and of secondary sources (Appendix A) is very meritorious; but

since this is the only one in recent times, a certain carelessness in its technical presentation is all the more regrettable. The General Index is of a rather casual character.

MARTIN ANTON SCHMIDT

San Francisco
Theological Seminary

The Mass and the English Reformers. By C. W. DUGMORE. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1958. xiv, 262 pp. \$8.50.

Dr. Dugmore's work is a carefully wrought, thoroughly documented analysis of the doctrine of the Eucharist held and defended by the English Reformers of the sixteenth century. In its specific concern, it is a stout defense of the "continuity" of the English Church with its patristic and mediaeval tradition through all the upheavals and external changes of the Reformation era. For its central thesis is that the Eucharistic doctrine held by Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley—once they had abandoned transubstantiation—was the realist-symbolist interpretation of Augustine, Ratramnus, and Berengar. This tradition, although it was officially laid aside by the definition of the Fourth Lateran Council, continued to be a living force in the late scholasticism, in which the Reformers were well informed. It was not mediated to the English Reformers by way of the Continental Reformation.

Several corollaries may be deduced from this basic thesis. For one thing, the leading English Reformers, though much indebted to Luther in the doctrine of justification, were never at any time committed to the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist, since the Lutheran doctrine of the "corporal" presence presented the same difficulties as did transubstantiation. There was no "Lutheran" phase to Cranmer's theological position regarding the sacrament; nor was the rite of the Prayer Book of 1549 in any way an expression of Lutheran doctrine.

On the other hand, the attempt of certain scholars to make a Zwinglian out of Cranmer is equally misguided—as much so as the contemporary testi-

mony of Hooper to the archbishop's views. Dr. Dugmore is at great pains to refute Cranmer's supposed Zwinglianism not only from the reformer's own words, but by a skillful comparison of the 1552 Prayer Book liturgy with the sacramental rites of John à Lasco and Valérand Poullain. It is well known, of course, that Cranmer had nothing to do with the famous Black Rubric, but that it was inserted in the 1552 Book by order of the Council. In like manner, Cranmer protested the promulgation of the Forty-two Articles by the Council, as though it had received the sanction of Convocation. Even so, says Dr. Dugmore, the rejection of a "bodily" presence (*corporalis*) in the Eucharist, according to Article XXIX, was not necessarily Zwinglian. For the word "had been used since the days of Paschasius Radbert by writers who upheld the presence of Christ's natural body as well as those who denied it."

Dr. Dugmore's book is an important corrective to one-sided and facile generalizations about the theology of the English Reformers. It provides an important perspective in depth that should not be overlooked. In its turn, it leans over backward to defend the independence of the English Reformers from Continental influence. While it is true that the leaders of the English Church were, in this matter, neither Lutheran nor Zwinglian, it is never made clear how close they were to Calvin. But there are hints here and there that Dr. Dugmore thinks Calvin, too, belonged to the Augustinian realist-symbolist tradition.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.
*Church Divinity School
of the Pacific*

American Literature and Christian Doctrine. By RANDALL STEWART. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958. xiii, 155 pp. \$3.50.

This book professedly purports to re-examine the sources of our democratic assumptions and to re-evaluate the interpretations of our culture which have been formulated by some of our most

important historians. Similarly, it appears to be questioning the validity of current opinions which imply that "democracy and Christianity are somehow incompatible." As a matter of fact, the author prophesies that American democracy will survive and thrive only if "a genuine Christian humility . . . becomes an essential part of our consciousness . . . (and) our thinking about democracy develops in a more distinctly Christian direction." In short, the upshot of Mr. Stewart's treatise is simply that the so-called "liberal" basis of American democracy is unorthodox and heretical from a Christian viewpoint, and it offers an "unsatisfactory rationale for the democratic way of life" in the present and for the future.

By way of a beginning, Mr. Stewart demonstrates that our democratic tradition is rooted in religion, especially and primarily that of New England Puritanism. Jonathan Edwards is then cited as the outstanding prototype of American theology (and philosophy), and his doctrines are described as being identical with the basic Christian doctrines. Moreover, we soon learn that Edwards was a Calvinist of sorts for whom Calvin's "Five Points" must, undoubtedly, have been authoritative. Just so, Mr. Stewart insists that there is such a thing as Christian orthodoxy which consists of five basic assumptions. He goes on to say that the principal assumption is, of course, Original Sin; and it is the recognition of this doctrine which constitutes the chief test for Christian orthodoxy. Obviously, the bulk of the book is given over to an analysis of American literary history in order to determine which of our major thinkers accepted or rejected the doctrine of Original Sin. We are not surprised to learn, therefore, that most of the primary contributors to our culture are found wanting when faced with Mr. Stewart's test of orthodoxy. In one bold stroke, the author denounces as heretical the rationalistic deism of Paine, Jefferson, and Franklin, the undisciplined intuitionism and deification of man by Emerson and Whitman, and the amoral, naturalistic

determinisms of Crane, Norris, Dreiser, and Farrell. In other words, most of our famous, influential, and democratic thinkers have "unmistakably strayed beyond the bounds of Christian orthodoxy."

The criterion of orthodoxy which Mr. Stewart has suggested is also quite useful for designating those great writers of our tradition who have been and are "orthodox." In spite of eighteenth-century rationalism, nineteenth-century romanticism, and twentieth-century naturalism, the "vein of iron" in the Puritan tradition has reasserted itself in our culture primarily through the art of Hawthorne, Melville, and James. These "counter-romantics" were preoccupied with the positive forces of Good and Evil. Hence, they were able to give artistic expression to a "profounder wisdom"—namely, Original Sin, the conflict between good and evil, man's struggle for redemption, and the note of suffering that is central to the Christian faith. Even more orthodox is the position of religious belief that characterizes the literature of Eliot, Tate, Warren, Hemingway, and Faulkner. Indeed, Mr. Stewart voices the opinion that Eliot's *Ash Wednesday* is "perhaps the chief Christian poem of our time," and Willa Cather's *Death Comes for the Archbishop* is "perhaps the outstanding explicitly Christian novel" of our century. At this juncture, we can do no less than laud Mr. Stewart's courageous effort to speak of a specifically Christian work of art at a time when most of his neo-orthodox and conservative allies are cautioning against such dangerous procedures.

There are, however, several aspects of this treatise which may raise questions in the minds of both theologians and literary critics. In the first place, Christian historians are not likely to accept, without qualification, the statement that "Calvinism and Arminianism . . . very nearly divided the theology of the American Protestant world between them." Equally suspect is the generalization that all the denominations in America, except Episcopalians, were Protestant because

they accepted Calvin's "Five Points," Puritan because they embodied "a vein of asceticism, of restraint, of discipline," and Christian because they were a combination of both. If such were the case, we would have to agree with Mr. Stewart that the word "Puritan" has, in fact, "usurped the legitimate role of 'Christian.'" Secondly, some theologians may find quite unpalatable the thesis that "all who reject the doctrine of Original Sin" are heretical liberals while those who give assent to this doctrine are orthodox Christians. Such a fundamentalistic viewpoint leads to a reductive oversimplification of Christian doctrine and an equally confused understanding of the various traditions within Christendom. Finally, Mr. Stewart's simple formula for making distinctions between and among the variety of complex literary texts that make up our aesthetic tradition can promote only a dualistic cataloging of literature depending upon whether the "liberal" or the "orthodox" doctrine of man is the organizing principle. Consequently, we need, I think, to accept Mr. Stewart's opening statement: "This little treatise makes no pretense to completeness and authoritativeness."

JOHN LOOSE

Gettysburg College

The Formation of the American Lutheran Church. By FRED W. MEUSER. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, 1958. xiv, 327 pp. Paper, \$3.50.

Sub-titled "a case study in Lutheran unity," this is a well-documented account of how one of our major Lutheran groups assumed its present form. The gestation period was long and arduous; the Ohio Synod, once a part of the Synodical Conference, and the Iowa Synod, which held a tenuous "secondary membership" in the General Council, found many things to disagree about before they finally merged in 1930. Up until then, the propensity of transplanted German Lutherans (19th century variety) to engage in bitter polemics, to fill their *Kirchenblätter* with charges and countercharges

es, had not diminished. In their passionate desire to seek out and preserve the *reine Lehre*, suspicion and open hostility often came to the fore.

But an intersynodical fellowship which dated back virtually to the middle of the 19th century was not to be denied. A major obstacle was cleared in 1881 when Ohio, because of its disagreement with the Missouri Synod over the predestination controversy, decided to leave the Synodical Conference. Iowa and Missouri had been at odds ever since 1854, when the Iowa Synod was formed as a result of a misunderstanding between the emissaries of Wilhelm Loehe (the non-emigrating "patron saint" of the Iowa Synod) and "certain Missouri pastors" in Michigan. Hence, after 1881, Ohio and Iowa found themselves occupying common ground by virtue of a mutual distrust of Missouri. A generation later, when Iowa decided not to go along with the General Council (*et al*) in the organization of the United Lutheran Church (1918), the last great stumblingblock in the road to union was removed.

And now, just 30 years later, the A.L.C. is about to surrender its synodical sovereignty in order to merge into a larger Lutheran body (with the E.L.C., *et al*). That is another story, not in the province of the book here reviewed, but it is of no small interest to compare the pre-merger negotiations in these two instances in which the A.L.C. has been involved. The negotiations leading up to the 1930 merger took about 50 years all told, and, as noted, these years were filled with numerous personality clashes, profound doctrinal strife, etc. In the present merger talks, on the other hand, this kind of agitation has been almost completely lacking. A number of "practical" problems (administration, control of church schools, etc.) have filled the agenda instead. In other words, the two German synods which took each other's measure for nearly a half-century before merging in 1930, have now decided in less than a decade to cross nationalistic lines and enter a more inclusive fellowship.

This, as it appears to me, is a significant mutation. What is the explanation? Several suggestions present themselves. One, the obvious assumption that the merging groups are in nearly complete agreement in respect to the doctrinal corpus; two, the influence of the current ecumenical atmosphere; three, the Americanization of the non-ULCA German Lutherans (might there even be hope for Missouri?), and finally, the absence of such competent and contentious theologians as the late Michael Reu, of Iowa (d. 1943).

In spite of a rather heavy, Teutonic touch in some areas, this book represents a valuable addition to the published records of the Lutheran Church in America. Just one word of dissent. The author makes the claim that the A.L.C. "has had a wider range of intersynodical contacts than any other Lutheran synod." As a member of the Augustana Lutheran Church, I am compelled to take polite issue.

GENE LUND

Concordia College
Moorhead, Minn.

Zwischen Idealismus und Massendemokratie: Eine Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland von 1815-1945. By KARL KUPISCH. Berlin: Lettner-Verlag, 1955. 296 pp. DM 9:80.

Karl Kupisch, professor at the Kirchliche Hochschule in Berlin, was actively engaged in the church struggle with Nazism and since then has been associated further with the groups which take their stand by the "theology of crisis" and the cultivation of the ecumenical fellowship. He has interested himself especially in those problems which lie on the frontiers of theology and church history: the significance of Marxism, the rise of the trade unions, the problems of industrialization and the mass-man, the failure of the churches to serve or even maintain contact with the intellectuals and the laboring classes. He has written on Bebel and other Socialist leaders. His biography of Engels, *Vom Pietismus zum Kommunismus* (1953), was

one of the most brilliant interpretations of Marx' friend and what he represented. In the present writing, one volume of a church history, he has shown a positive genius for relating major social issues to the ongoing stream of the intellectual and practical life of the church. *Zwischen Idealismus und Massendemokratie* is brilliantly written, one of the most readable books I have seen in German history, lively with short biographies and descriptions of key personalities. At the same time there runs through it a clear line of interpretation, from Schleiermacher to Barth, from Jena to the collapse of the Third Reich. There are no footnotes, but a short bibliography is given at the end for each chapter.

Professor Kupisch shows the way in which the immanentist philosophy of the patriotic preacher, Schleiermacher, developed into the preaching of Friedrich Naumann in World War I—"a mixture of Potsdam and Bethlehem" (p. 145). He shows how the continuum of Christ and culture developed by the nineteenth century theology betrayed the faith: "Ritschl's liberalism laid the foundations for modern Protestant culture-religion" (p. 135). The tradition represented at its best by Adolf von Harnack can be summed up in Harnack's 1901 address at the Memorial Convocation of the University in Berlin: "In our historical work we can and may not think of the teachings and needs of the churches; if we should have anything in view except the pure recognition of Fact, we would be forgetting our obligation." When Karl Barth raised the dimension of personal history and asked the question whether the scholar has no "theological" as well as "scientific" responsibility, Harnack's answer was consistent: "You turn the theological professorship into a preaching professorship!" (p. 174). The "objectivity" of the old liberalism ended in the shameful capitulation of the German Christians to the Nazi church politics. The "preachers," in the meantime, have begun to write systematic theologies and church histories. There is no doubt but that Professor Kupisch feels involved. There is also no doubt but

that he has written first class history.

FRANKLIN H. LITTELL
Emory University

Horace Bushnell: Minister to a Changing America. By BARBARA M. CROSS. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958. xiv, 201 pp. \$6.00.

If it were not for his essay, *Christian Nurture*, many would find it difficult to say much about Horace Bushnell, other than that he belongs in that large group of clergy who contributed to the theological confusion of New England's past. There are those who were trained in theological seminaries a generation and more ago who report, often surreptitiously, that they still read this nineteenth century American theologian; students of more recent years associate him all too readily with the volume which has been read so avidly by religious educators. Of more significance than this book are his essays on *Forgiveness and the Law*, the important lectures issued under the title, *God in Christ*, and *Nature and the Supernatural*, to name but a few. It is time that Bushnell is given his rightful place as one of America's great theologians, one who deserves an impressive position in the whole panorama of nineteenth century Protestant theology.

Barbara Cross has written the first substantial interpretive study of Bushnell to appear in many years. In brief compass she has indicated his significance in the changing social context of New England, showing the way in which Bushnell dealt with the problems posed by the widening gulfs among social classes and the changing patterns of home and civic life. From his early years as the son of a farmer, Bushnell went to Yale where he came under the influence of Nathaniel William Taylor. Later he became pastor of the "urban" North Church in Hartford. During these years Bushnell sought to develop an interpretation of the Gospel which would fit both his rural background and the quite different structure of Hartford society, keeping in mind the prevailing theo-

logical debates among Transcendentalists, Unitarians, and "orthodox Calvinists." Mrs. Cross brings new insight to these forces shaping his life in a style which invites close reading.

This reader misses in her book, as he also did in Theodore Munger's earlier study of Bushnell (which was written more with the perspective of a disciple) a thorough effort to relate Bushnell to other theological contexts. Though there are brief analyses of his relation to N. W. Taylor and S. T. Coleridge, one wishes for a more complete examination of Bushnell's position in the grand tradition of New England theology, his reception by important figures within the Presbyterian Church, and his role in relation to continental figures of nineteenth century theology. One might also desire more detailed examination of Bushnell's particular perspectives on such issues as the doctrine of the atonement or Christology in relation to the whole development of Christian thought. But then this would be an ambitious assignment which goes beyond the aim of the author, which is "to analyze the religious thought of Horace Bushnell and the emergence of his theology from his society and tradition." Mrs. Cross has shown clearly "the emergence of his theology from his society" but to this reviewer she has not dealt as adequately with "the emergence of his theology from his . . . tradition."

This book is an important contribution to the study of the various currents in New England social history of the nineteenth century. The fact that there is still need for a more intensive study of Bushnell's theological contribution to the American and continental scene does not detract from the important and perceptive work Mrs. Cross has given us.

ROBERT L. FERM

Pomona College,
Claremont, California

Dispensationalism in America, Its Rise and Development. By C. NORMAN KRAUS. Richmond, Virginia:

The John Knox Press, 1958. 156 pp. \$3.00.

This is a study of one of the exotic yet respectable by-ways of dogma down which a large number of nineteenth-century and a significant number of twentieth-century Protestants have travelled. We should thank Menonite theologian Kraus for exploring a route which for dispensationalists has seemed too broad and straight to require a map and for church historians too rutted and circuitous to deserve one.

Kraus introduces his subject with sketches of seven leaders of late nineteenth-century dispensationalism and their age schemes. These patterns for the ages, as Kraus calls them, vary only in detail and provide the movement's hallmark. The *Scofield Reference Bible* supplied a synthesis of the early systems and carries their influence into churches today. These dispensations—Adamic, Noahic, Abrahamic, etc.—are considered self-contained, independent epochs with very little, if any, historical continuity. God, the dispensationalist would say, has dealt with man in different ways at different times, but He always initiates his action through a covenant, works out his purposes in the world in spite of man's obedience or disobedience, and finally brings the dispensation to a close by judging those who have failed to fulfill the covenant. As Kraus, and others before him, have noticed, dispensationalism accomplished for some conservatives exactly what higher criticism accomplished for liberals. The problem of Jesus vs. Paul, for instance, was argued by both schools with the same results. The dispensationalist interpretation: Jesus offered the Kingdom to the Jews, and his teachings—the Sermon on the Mount, for instance—do not apply to the Church.

The origin of this modern dispensationalism Kraus locates in the teachings of J. N. Darby, the English founder of the Plymouth Brethren movement. Darby, almost unknown to church historians, has exerted a pro-

found influence outside his own denomination, for it was his eschatology and (especially) his ecclesiology which gave such a characteristic stamp to dispensationalism, premillennialism, and eventually fundamentalism. Darby visited North America frequently, travelling to the U.S. three times in the 1870's. He and his disciples considered themselves missionaries, but they evangelized from the pulpits of influential evangelical churches. Their message was directed more to puzzled Christians than unbelievers.

In the 1870's this dispensationalism of the Plymouth Brethren met, merged with, and finally captured the premillennial movement. Here again Kraus has had to work through unknown territory. Premillennialism first gained public notice in 1878 when a number of Calvinistic clergymen of different denominations held a well-attended conference in New York City in order to popularize their teachings. They were offering a "minority report" on the American scene, voicing skepticism concerning man's ability to build the Kingdom of God from the materials of the American Republic. Kraus feels—and my own research confirms—that these were not despairing pessimists nor frightened incipient fundamentalists, but a last regiment of Calvin's stout soldiers unwilling to surrender the fortress of man's inability to the overwhelming charge of manifest destiny. The conferences were popular, aroused a good deal of comment, and won converts to the movement; but, after the first meeting, their platform was progressively dominated by dispensationalists.

Kraus approached this study (according to the dust jacket) in order to combat dispensationalism's disquieting invasion of his own denomination. He traces its history in order to refute its theology. In this, I feel, he failed to see the real significance of the movement. In tracing the origin of dispensationalism, Kraus has uncovered the seed plot of fundamentalism. The theology of fundamentalism is dispensationalism, its Bible, the *Scofield Reference Bible*. Ever since the publica-

tion of Stewart G. Cole's *History of Fundamentalism*, historians have vaguely referred to the premillennial conferences of the late nineteenth century as fundamentalism's point of origin. My own study of those conferences, however, left me puzzled. Although fundamentalists were obviously running the conferences in 1914 and 1918, men of a basically different stamp were in charge in 1878. In tracing the rise of dispensationalism through J. N. Darby, Kraus has put his finger on the real founding father of fundamentalism. When the black pessimism of the twentieth century began to sweep over the souls of those afflicted by the rise of evolution and higher criticism, the dispensationalism of J. N. Darby stood ready to confirm their gloomy prognostication and yet to provide hope.

All dispensations up to the present have ended in failure and the judgment of God upon the world. Even so, continues the dispensational argument, will this age end. The existence of an apostate Church, like Israel of old, following its own lusts (higher criticism), provides the inescapable witness. What then is God's will for his few remaining Elijahs? Here Darby's ecclesiology becomes pertinent. The Church is not the denomination (and how well had a century of religious freedom prepared Americans to accept that idea). The Church is an invisible fellowship of saints called out from among the mass of conforming Christians. And with that teaching was born the structure of fundamentalism—the faith mission, the Bible conference, the Bible church, the withdrawals from apostate denominations, the interdenominational fundamentalist college, the inroads into Kraus' own Mennonite denomination.

The task of the Church is likewise transformed from the conversion of a people to the "out-gathering" of the elect. "The Church exists as a sort of guerrilla resistance movement awaiting the army of liberation. As a consequence its strategy . . . [is] guerrilla tactics." (108) The social implications of the gospel are ignored and emphasis

is placed on "decisions for Christ." We are not then surprised to hear Billy Graham quoted several weeks ago as saying, "We [evangelists] all milk the Plymouth Brethren cow."

Kraus, in analyzing this movement, has unintentionally written the best introduction to the understanding of fundamentalism now in print.

ERNEST R. SANDEEN

*North Park College
and Seminary, Chicago*

Christian Science Today. By CHARLES S. BRADEN. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1958. 432 pp. \$5.95.

Prof. Braden has written a penetrating and critical appraisal of the power, policy and practice of the Christian Science Church since the death of Mrs. Eddy. The study will undoubtedly become the standard introduction to this faith in many colleges and seminaries, but the author quite evidently had a wider audience in mind—Christian Scientists themselves. Prof. Braden's reputation is well established among church historians; his self-conscious preface—patiently explaining his honest intent and laying bare his ingrown prejudices—was certainly unnecessary if he only intended to address historians. But in addressing Christian Scientists it is not surprising that he felt the need to disallow base motives. The historiography of Christian Science would not encourage sanguine hopes about the reception of any work however cautiously and circumspectly written.

Although ostensibly describing the operation of one of America's homebred religions, Prof. Braden builds up an indictment against the dictatorial and autocratic control of Christian Science by the Board of Directors of the Mother Church. Only on the last page of the book does he express what has been implicit in his presentation all along: "... if freedom is a value which persists in man's relationships, if our democracy maintains itself, then soon or late totalitarianisms in religion will break down and

among them that of Christian Science" (401).

The first section of the book, provided only for background, ably and succinctly traces the origin of this healing movement in the life of Mary Baker Eddy and the organization which she founded. Forced to a brevity which he is not so conscientious about observing in later pages, Prof. Braden here provides the best introduction to the movement which I have seen. Parts II and III describe the development of the machinery and theology of Christian Science. Of primary importance in the second section is the well-documented analysis of the control of the Board of Directors over the activities and even the words of practitioners, readers and lecturers. The picture is a frightening one, and Prof. Braden has, I believe, emphasized the right aspect of the situation. Whatever the value of the teaching of Mary Baker Eddy (not a matter which the historian should judge), it ought not to be propagated by Directors whose claims to God, Truth, Mind, etc., can only be maintained by the most unjustifiable totalitarianism—censorship imposed upon non-Christian Scientists, distortion of history, police-state tactics in the discipline of their own members. Surely a denomination that claims Christian as a part of its name must be willing to be judged by the moral standards of the Christian faith.

In tracing the development of Christian Science thought, Prof. Braden has been particularly interested in showing that the "party line" adopted by the Directors has been quite frequently attacked by Scientists themselves for deviation from the real meaning of Mary Baker Eddy. The most serious dissenting movement maintains that Mrs. Eddy intended her church to disorganize at her death, continuing without any monolithic structure to dictate to the "field."

I find only one point at which I seriously disagree with Prof. Braden. Early in the book he states, "Any group which makes the Bible the basis of its faith and makes Christ so central as

Christian Scientists do can hardly be refused the name Christian. . . . The church has come to be respected and almost, if not quite, fully accepted by her sister churches" (10). The following pages of the book seem flatly to disprove the first statement. Christian Science was the creation of a woman who was historically conditioned by the nineteenth-century American evangelical ethos, but in our time—on the basis of Prof. Braden's own analysis—Christian Scientists seem able to subsist on the virtual worship of Mrs. Eddy and the reading of her famous book. I have not been aware that the "sister churches" were about to fully accept the Christian Science Church as a blood relative, but they might well be warned by Prof. Braden that they are embracing a group whose professions are seriously compromised by their power, policy and practice. Another small point in the interest of

accuracy: didn't Arthur Brisbane's interview with Mrs. Eddy (40) occur on an entirely different day than that reported in the *New York World*?

Prof. Braden has spent years in the study of Christian Science, and the fruits of his scholarly analysis of the church since Mrs. Eddy have only been hinted at. This type of study requires a special type of grace, for of encouragement from the Christian Science authorities he has had none. So often the Christian church has been willing to learn about the "cults and sects" through the professional debunker or the disenchanted convert, and the result has been misunderstanding—often bigotry. When a historian of Prof. Braden's calibre devotes himself to this type of study, he deserves our warm thanks.

ERNEST SANDEEN

*North Park College
and Seminary, Chicago*

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

December 28, 1959

The vice-president, Jerald C. Brauer, called the meeting to order at the Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, with J. C. Brauer, H. J. Grimm, W. S. Hudson, G. S. Klett, L. A. Loetscher, R. S. Michaelsen, J. H. Nichols, F. A. Norwood, C. E. Schneider, E. J. Schwiebert, and H. S. Smith present. The minutes were approved as printed. The treasurer's report was approved, having been audited by P. L. Meacham and W. W. Manross. Paul L. Meacham and Theodore Tappert were appointed auditors for next year.

It was moved, seconded, and voted that a committee of at least five be appointed by the president to formulate research plans for a study of the church's role in Negro higher education in the South and to prepare a proposal concerning this study to be presented to a foundation for financial support; it being understood that the Society has no funds of its own for this project.

The report of the editors was received and approved with expressions of gratitude and praise. The editors were authorized to use their own discretion with regard to the photographic reproduction of past issues; to print the list of past officers of the Society only in conjunction with the list of members; to spend not more than \$1000 for clerical help; and to investigate the possibility of increasing the size of the journal.

The invitation to hold the 1961 Spring Meeting in Toronto was accepted.

The following persons were elected members of the Society, subject to the

usual constitutional provision: Dale Allen, Walter F. Bense, Raymond M. Bost, Wayne E. Boyd, Oscar W. Cooper, Jr., Paul A. Crow, Jr., Natalie Z. Davis, Eric Dean, George Drake, Mark C. Ebersole, J. Rodney Fulcher, Charles Garside, Ronald W. Graham, Richard E. Grothe, Thomas O. Hanley, Joseph M. Harte, Allan Hauck, R. W. Hays, Fred Hill, William J. Houston, Jr., Claude L. Howe, Jr., T. Donald Hughes, John M. Kalny, Richard H. Kerbs, Richard Kern, William F. Kochel, Ernest Lashlee, William G. LeLacheur, Herbert R. Loring, Albert J. Loomie, Lloyd J. Lowe, Richard G. Luman, William L. McClelland, Robert E. McNally, Earl R. MacComac, Robert E. Malsberry, Frederick Maser, Ronald Matthias, C. Mervyn Maxwell, Roland Nelson, William B. Miller, Walter Oetting, V. Norskov Olsen, Edward M. Panosian, George F. Parker, William O. Paulsell, Lindsey P. Pherigo, J. Manning Potts, Georg S. Robbert, John S. Romanides, Henry Rosenberg, G. W. Rusling, Mable R. Shipley, A. W. Skardon, Verlyn Smith, A. M. Stene, Richard A. Soloway, Gordon J. Spykman, Kenneth A. Strand, Frank E. Sugeno, Robert J. Tollefson, Herman F. Wendler, John F. Wilson, Carl A. Volz, W. Curtis Young. The membership committee reported the deaths of the following members: Karl F. Eaheart, Walter J. Goerner, Arthur A. Hays, Puzant H. Kalfayan, Arthur Klinck, W. W. Sweet, Frank H. Yost. It was voted to ask Sidney E. Mead to draft a minute concerning the service of W. W. Sweet to the Society to be published in *Church History*.

Attest: Winthrop S. Hudson,
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY

December 29, 1959

President Robert T. Handy called the meeting to order. The minutes were approved as printed. Nominations were presented and the proposed officers and committees were duly elected, as follows: President, J. C. Brauer; Vice-president, H. J. Grimm; Secretary, W. S. Hudson; Assistant Secretary, R. S. Michaelsen; Treasurer, Guy S. Klett; New member of the Council, Albert Outler; Editors, J. H. Nichols and F. A. Norwood; Membership Committee: Lefferts A. Loetscher, chairman, Sidney E. Mead, William R. Cannon, Sydney E. Ahlstrom, J. R. von Rohr, E. Clifford Nelson, W. Lyndon Smith, and James Leo Carrett; Committee on program and local arrangements for the 1961 Spring Meeting in Toronto: W. Lyndon Smith, chairman, Kenneth Cousland, and Eugene Fairweather.

The treasurer's report was received; the secretary reported the actions of the Council, and F. A. Norwood reported for the editors of *Church History*.

The program at this meeting included the following papers: "The Problem of Papal Primacy at the Council of Florence" by M. A. Schmidt; "The Political Aspects of the Union of Florence in Muscovite Territories" by J. J. Zatko; "The Reinterpretation of the Council of Trent" by Jaroslav Pelikan; "The Reinterpretation of Puritanism" by G. L. Mosse; "Some Ecumenical Developments in Church History" by F. H. Littell; "Bibliographical Problems in American Church History" by N. R. Burr; "Dis-senting Deputies and the American Colonies" by M. W. Armstrong; "The Role of the South in the Presbyterian Schism, 1835-38" by E. A. Smith; "The Weber-Tawney Thesis and American Puritanism" by Karl A. Hertz; "A Re-examination of the Weber Thesis" by Winthrop S. Hudson; and the presidential address by Robert T. Handy.

Attest: Winthrop S. Hudson,
Secretary

SUMMARY REPORT ON THE CHURCH HISTORY SELF-STUDY PROJECT, 1958-59

During the academic year 1958-59 the practicing church historians of the United States and Canada participated in a series of meetings planned to help make more meaningful the vocation of the church historian and to enlarge the perspectives of the practitioners of the discipline. The Self-Study Project was set up under the leadership of Professor George Huntington Williams of Harvard, then President of the American Society of Church History, with the counsel of Dr. Charles L. Taylor of the American Association of Theological Schools and Colleges. The Project was made possible through a generous grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., of Indianapolis, Indiana, and Mr. G. Harold Duling of that organization took a personal interest in the work.

At the request of the President of ASCH, the executive committee of the organization at its annual meeting at Christmas time, 1957, approved the proposal. A steering committee was constituted, selected from among church historians in the Boston/Cambridge area and readily accessible to the President. Members were Professor Raymond W. Albright of Episcopal Theological School, Professor Richard M. Cameron of Boston University School of Theology, Professor John Woolman Brush of Andover-Newton Theological School; later Professor Robert T. Handy of Union Theological Seminary (elected President of ASCH at the annual meeting, 1958) joined the committee.

A "trial flight" was made at Boston on October 21-November 1, 1958.

Program Chairman was Dr. Williams, and Dr. Cameron served as Chairman of Arrangements. There followed seven more Regional Meetings:

Evanston (November 7-8), with Professor Samuel Laeuchli of Garrett (Program) and Dr. Walter Lebrecht of the Evanston Ecumenical Institute (Arrangements);

Atlanta (November 21-22), with Professor Ray C. Petry of Duke (Program) and Professor William Mallard of Emory (Arrangements);

Pittsburgh (February 20-21), with Professor Elwyn A. Smith and Professor Frank D. McCloy of Western sharing the responsibilities;

Berkeley (February 27-28), with Professor Massey H. Shepherd of the Church Divinity School of the Pacific (Program Chairman) and Professor John von Rohr of Pacific School of Religion (Arrangements);

St. Paul (March 6-7), with Professor E. Clifford Nelson in charge;

Toronto (April 3-4), with Principal Kenneth H. Cousland of Emmanuel College (Program) and Professor Allan L. Farris of Knox College (Arrangements);

Dallas (April 10-11), with Professor William E. Clebsch of the Episcopal Seminary of the Southwest (Program) and Professors Outler, Hogg and Shipley of Perkins sharing the arrangements.

In each case after the Boston meeting the institutions accredited or affiliated by the AATS received direct notification of the regional meeting where their representatives were invited, and the church historians involved were invited directly by the Program Chairman. In addition to the Secretary's paper, which was read and discussed at each meeting, papers were read by the following men:

Prof. George H. Williams: "The History of Church History at Harvard" (Boston meeting);

Prof. L. C. Rudolph: "The History of Church History at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary" (Atlanta);

Prof. Frank D. McCloy: "The History of Church History at Western

Theological Seminary" (Pittsburgh);

Prof. Clifford M. Drury: "The History of Church History at the San Francisco Theological Seminary" (Berkeley);

Prof. Bernhard Holm: "The History of Church History at Wartburg Theological Seminary" (St. Paul);

Prof. W. L. Smith: "The History of Church History at Trinity College" (Toronto);

Prof. R. M. Saunders of the Department of History, University of Toronto: "The General Historian and the Church Historian" (Toronto);

Prof. A. T. DeGroot of Brite College of the Bible/TCU: "The History of Church History in the Disciples of Christ" (Dallas).

At Evanston, Prof. Samuel Laeuchli of Garrett read a second paper on the meaning of church history.

Mimeographed reports were compiled by the Secretary, with the occasional help of other participants, and mailed to all participants in the Colloquia. They were also sent to seminary administrators who expressed special interest in the series.

The discussions were intentionally unstructured, and ranged from intensive debate on various hypotheses advanced concerning the theology of church history through questions on organization of the curriculum to practical exchange of experience with specific teaching methods and materials. The meetings fitted appropriately into a series of regional consultations at Berkeley and Dallas, and at Toronto it was the occasion of a planning meeting for setting up a Canadian Society of Church History on a fraternal basis with the ASCH.

The participants repeatedly expressed their gratitude to the AATS and Lilly Endowment for the opportunity for professional discussions of this level, and were glad to learn later that the style of meeting will be carried forward now with colleagues in Missions, Social Ethics and Homiletics.

Franklin H. Littell, Secretary
Church History Self-Study Project

REPORT OF THE TREASURER December 1, 1958 - November 30, 1959

I. CURRENT FUNDS

A. SUMMARY AND BALANCE

<i>Receipts</i>	
Balance on hand, December 1, 1958	\$ 4,119.06
Membership Dues	\$2,999.50
Income from <i>Church History</i>	3,622.81
<i>Studies</i>	9.62
Special	127.74 6,759.67
Total Receipts	\$10,878.73
<i>Disbursements</i>	
Expenses of management of Society	\$1,423.03
Publication of <i>Church History</i>	4,181.66
Special	205.13
Total Disbursements	5,809.82
Cash on hand, November 30, 1959, in Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co. Checking Account (Bank Statement)	\$6,027.58
Less outstanding checks	958.67 5,068.91
	\$10,878.73

B. GENERAL FUNDS AND MAGAZINE

<i>Receipts</i>	
Membership dues paid	\$ 2,999.50
Subscriptions to <i>Church History</i>	\$2,758.53
Sale of copies	379.28
Advertising in <i>Church History</i>	485.00 3,622.81
	\$ 6,622.31

MANAGEMENT OF SOCIETY

<i>Disbursements</i>	
Postage and express charges	\$ 25.00
Printing and mimeographing	133.00
Stationery and supplies	263.59
Secretarial services for Secretary, Treasurer	314.75
Safe Deposit Box	5.50
Expenses of Secretary and Treasurer	156.19
Bond of Treasurer	25.00
Treasurer's stipend	500.00

1,423.03

SPECIAL EXPENDITURES

Luncheon, Dec., 1958	\$ 149.50
Returned checks & refunds	20.00
Service charge of bank	5.13
Committee expense	30.50

205.13

PUBLICATION OF *CHURCH HISTORY*

Printing and distribution of magazine	\$3,507.88
Postage and express charges	178.39
Stationery and supplies	34.57
Secretarial services	460.82 4,181.66
	\$ 5,809.82



The First Volume
in *Religious Perspectives*

The Historic Reality of Christian Culture

A Way to the Renewal of Human Life

BY CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVES, a new series edited by RUTH NANDA ANSHEN, deals with basic spiritual concerns in the light of world history and of man's relation to the universe. In the first volume in the series, the distinguished Catholic historian, teacher and thinker examines the dynamic role Christianity has played in Western civilization. Dr. Dawson concludes with a plea for a greater study of Christian tradition and for making its study a basis of liberal education. Here, he believes, lies a way to the renewal of human life. \$3.00

Holy Writ or Holy Church

By GEORGE H. TAVARD



"Shall we listen to the Church or to the Bible? Father Tavard marshals materials from both Protestant and Catholic theology so skillfully and fairly that no treatment of the problem of Catholic-Protestant relations can afford to overlook his conclusions."—JAROSLAV PELIKAN

"Meticulously traces both Catholic and Protestant interpretations of Sacred Scriptures and the relationship with the idea of the Church . . . illuminating."—CARLTON J. H. HAYES. \$5.00



The New Shape of American Religion

By MARTIN E. MARTY

"This book contains the sharpest, and in many ways the most profound, study of the contemporary religious situation in this country that I have come across. Dr. Marty is not content with merely summarizing, or even generalizing the material; he reinterprets it from the point of view of a living Christian faith, and so comes up with some very illuminating, often startling, conclusions about our religious life."—WILL HERBERG, author of *Protestant-Catholic-Jew*. \$5.50

At your bookstore

HARPER & BROTHERS, N.Y. 16

The Idea of Reform

ITS IMPACT ON CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND ACTION IN THE AGE OF THE FATHERS

By GERHART B. LADNER. Reform, to the Church Fathers, was basically the idea of man's reformation toward his original image-likeness with God. This book describes the impact of this key idea on Christian thought and action through early Christian and medieval times. "A very remarkable piece of work . . . his command of a truly formidable array of modern scholarship inspires awe and admiration."—HERBERT BLOCH. \$10.00

Edmund Burke and Ireland

By THOMAS H. D. MAHONEY. More than any statesman of his time, Edmund Burke saw the problems of Ireland clearly and sympathetically. He favored a reformed Irish Parliament, was liberal on the Catholic issue, and fought to terminate misrule. This book which examines Burke's lifelong preoccupation with Ireland provides valuable material that has never before received proper attention from biographers and historians. \$7.50

Religious Education in German Schools

AN HISTORICAL APPROACH

By ERNST CHRISTIAN HEILMREICH. This detailed account of religious instruction in elementary and secondary German schools touches upon history, political science, and education, as well as religion, providing a more complete understanding of the German school system. It offers an ideal opportunity to make comparisons with the systems of other nations. \$7.50

Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism, 1521-1555

By STEPHEN A. FISCHER-GALATI. The first systematic investigation explaining the inter-relationship between the conflicting imperialisms—Hapsburg and Ottoman—and the rise of Lutheranism in Germany. The author shows how, by diverting the attention of the Hapsburgs, the Turks contributed substantially to the recognition and development of Lutheranism. \$4.00

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Your Christian Heritage... Revealed in the Light of Contemporary Theology

John Wesley's Theology Today

By Colin W. Williams

This work examines the main beliefs of John Wesley—salvation, experience, original sin, repentance, atonement, new birth, church, perfection, and eschatology—to give a complete picture of Wesleyan theology. Dr. Williams gives special treatment to issues of vital contemporary interest such as the ministry and the sacraments.

This work also seeks to discover if Methodism has been given any insights which she is duty bound to share with other Christians, and if her traditions throw light on the issues that divide the churches. An extensive bibliography and an appendix of "Wesley's Doctrine of the Church and Ministry as Seen in the History of His Relation to the Church of England" are included.

In a study in evangelical Christian thought and church history, this book presents a clear statement of the beliefs that give rise to the sweeping religious revival in the 18th century. \$4.50

The Gospel of Truth

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

By Kendrick Grobel

This volume contains an English translation from the original Coptic of *The Gospel of Truth*, one of the many important documents found in 1945 in upper Egypt. Also included is an enlightening commentary that will be helpful in understanding the meaning of the text.

The once lost Egyptian manuscripts are now believed to have been written by adherents of Gnosticism—a philosophico-religious movement which flourished and which was denounced as blasphemous by the Church in early Christian times. *The Gospel of Truth* is not a record of the life and teachings of Jesus like the New Testament gospels, but it is a meditation on the good news of salvation which Christ brought and is.

\$4

Order from your bookstore today!

Abingdon Press

PUBLISHER OF THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE

